

**SELECTED WORKS OF MOTILAL NEHRU**



*Motilal Nehru in his study in Anand Bhawan*

# SELECTED WORKS OF **MOTILAL NEHRU**

Volume Four  
(1923-1925)

*Edited by*  
RAVINDER KUMAR and HARI DEV SHARMA

MLSU - CENTRAL LIBRARY



104404CL

ISSUED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF  
NEHRU MEMORIAL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY



VIKAS PUBLISHING HOUSE PVT LTD

VIKAS PUBLISHING HOUSE PVT LTD  
*Regd. Office: 5 Ansari Road, New Delhi 110002*

COPYRIGHT © NEHRU MEMORIAL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY, 1986

ISBN 0-7069-3042-7



# CONTENTS

xi

## Preface

### Correspondence, 1923-25

1. To W.S. Mukadam
2. To Jawahar
3. To C.V. Rajagopalachari
4. To Sita Ram
5. To Chandan Singh
6. To A.M. Khwaja
7. To Duni Chand
8. To Dwarka Prasad
9. To O.M. Chiene
10. To M.R. Jayakar
11. A circular letter to members of  
AICC & PCCs
12. To the Editor
13. To the Editor
14. To Manohar Nath Sapru
15. Telegram for Nabha Visit
16. To Kapildeva Malaviya
17. To Secretary, Home Department
18. Telegram to the Editor,  
Amrita Bazar Patrika
19. Telegram to A.T. Gidwani
20. To Krishnakant Malaviya
21. To Secretary, Home Department
22. To Bipin Chandra Pal
23. To Secretary of State for India
24. To S.V. Kowjalgi
25. To Jawahar
26. To the Editor
27. Telegram to M.R. Jayakar
28. The Swaraj Party Circular
29. To Rana
30. To Jawaharlal Rohatgi
31. Telegram to Devadas Gandhi
32. To M.R. Jayakar
33. To Party Leaders
34. Telegram to Ben Spoor &  
Colonel Wedgwood
35. Telegram to Colonel Wedgwood
36. Telegram to Mahatma Gandhi
37. Telegram to Colonel Wedgwood

9 January	1923	3
13 January	1923	4
29 January	1923	6
31 January	1923	6
31 January	1923	7
3 February	1923	8
3 February	1923	8
12 February	1923	9
24 February	1923	9
2 March	1923	12
1 May	1923	13
August	1923	17
August	1923	20
7 September	1923	23
September	1923	24
1 October	1923	24
18 October	1923	25
19 October	1923	26
20 October	1923	26
20 October	1923	27
22 October	1923	27
24 October	1923	28
24 October	1923	28
6 November	1923	29
16 November	1923	29
7 December	1923	30
19 December	1923	32
December	1923	32
1 January	1924	33
19 January	1924	34
22 January	1924	34
23 January	1924	35
24 January	1924	37
22 February	1924	39
12 March	1924	39
18 March	1924	39
19 March	1924	40

38. Telegram to S.R. Bomanji	24 March	1924	40
39. To Party Members	24 March	1924	40
40. To Mahatma Gandhi	24 May	1924	41
41. To the Joint Secretary, (Home) Government of India	2 June	1924	41
42. To Jawahar	14 June	1924	42
43. To Jawahar	15 June	1924	43
44. To M.R. Jayakar	2 July	1924	44
45. To Mahatma Gandhi	10 July	1924	46
46. To Jawahar	11 July	1924	49
47. To Kantilal Parekh	12 July	1924	50
48. To Mahatma Gandhi	25 July	1924	51
49. To C.R. Das	27 July	1924	52
50. To Satyendra Chandra Mitra	27 July	1924	54
51. To Rangaswami Iyengar	27 July	1924	55
52. To M.R. Jayakar	27 July	1924	56
53. To Mahatma Gandhi	28 July	1924	57
54. To M.R. Jayakar	2 August	1924	58
55. To S.A. Brelvi	4 August	1924	59
56. Telegram to M.R. Jayakar	7 August	1924	60
57. To M.R. Jayakar	7 August	1924	60
58. To M.R. Jayakar	8 August	1924	62
59. To Editor, Times of India	10 August	1924	62
60. To Mahatma Gandhi	12 August	1924	64
61. Telegram to Mahatma Gandhi	19 August	1924	66
62. To Mahatma Gandhi	25 August	1924	66
63. To F.E. Dinshaw	26 August	1924	69
64. To Mahatma Gandhi	28 August	1924	70
65. Telegram to Editors	28 August	1924	71
66. Telegram to Rafi Ahmad Kidwai	1 September	1924	71
67. Telegram to Maulvi Shafee	2 September	1924	71
68. To Mahatma Gandhi	2 September	1924	72
69. Telegram to Mahatma Gandhi	2 September	1924	74
70. Telegram to Mohanlal Saksena	8 September	1924	74
71. Telegram to K.M. Panikkar	9 September	1924	75
72. Telegram to C.R. Das	10 September	1924	75
73. Telegram to C.R. Das	12 September	1924	75
74. Telegram	17 September	1924	76
75. Telegram to Maulana Abdul Bari	3 October	1924	76
76. Telegram to Mrs. Jinnah	3 October	1924	76
77. Telegram to Editor, The Statesman	October	1924	77
78. To Purshotamdas Thakurdas	8 October	1924	77
79. To N.C. Kelkar	18 October	1924	79
80. To Purshotamdas Thakurdas	19 October	1924	80
81. Telegram for Leaders' Conference on Repression in Bengal	October	1924	83
82. Telegram to Mahatma Gandhi	2 November	1924	83
83. Telegram to Murarilal Rohatgi	7 November	1924	84

# Contents

84. To Purshotamdas Thakurdas	10 November	1924	84
85. To the Elected Members	11 November	1924	85
86. To Purshotamdas Thakurdas	14 November	1924	86
87. To S.A. Brelvi	27 November	1924	86
88. To Lalji Naranji	28 November	1924	87
89. To Henry Moncrieff Smith	28 November	1924	88
90. To W.B. Brett	29 November	1924	89
91. Press Notice	November	1924	89
92. To C.Y. Chintamani	1 December	1924	90
93. Telegram to M.A. Jinnah	1 December	1924	90
94. To Purshotamdas Thakurdas	2 December	1924	91
95. Telegram to Gopalrao Dalvi	2 December	1924	92
96. To Purshotamdas Thakurdas	3 December	1924	93
97. A Circular	3 December	1924	93
98. To Mohanlal Saksena	4 December	1924	94
99. To Dwarka Prasad	4 December	1924	95
100. A Circular	5 December	1924	96
101. To Purshotamdas Thakurdas	8 December	1924	97
102. To Secretary, Cow Preservation League	9 December	1924	97
103. To Purshotamdas Thakurdas	10 December	1924	98
104. To B.S. Moonje	11 December	1924	99
105. Telegram to S.R. Bomanji		1924	100
106. Circular for Party Members	1 January	1925	100
107. Circular for Party Members	2 January	1925	100
108. To Estate Officer, Delhi	7 January	1925	101
109. To C.R. Reddy	8 January	1925	101
110. Telegram to Estate Officer, Delhi	14 January	1925	102
111. Telegram to C.R. Das	15 January	1925	102
112. Circular for Party Members	15 January	1925	103
113. Telegram to C.R. Das	15 January	1925	103
114. Telegram to M.R. Jayakar	16 January	1925	103
115. To Jawahar	19 January	1925	104
116. To S Satyamurti	29 January	1925	105
117. To B S Moonje	5 February	1925	105
118. To Jawahar	6 February	1925	106
119. A Circular	15 February	1925	107
120. Telegram to Mahatma Gandhi	23 February	1925	108
121. Telegram to Mahatma Gandhi	24 February	1925	108
122. Telegram to Kantilal Parekh	3 March	1925	108
123. To M R. Jayakar	20 March	1925	109
124. A Circular	1 April	1925	111
125. To Seth Govind Das	3 April	1925	111
126. To Purshotamdas Thakurdas	3 April	1925	113
127. To Lalji Naranji	3 April	1925	114
128. To Syed Mahmud	6 April	1925	114
129. To Syed Mahmud	13 April	1925	115
130. To Khwaja	15 April	1925	115

131. To Lalji Naranji	19 April	1925	116
132. Telegram to Tara Singh	20 April	1925	117
133. Telegram to Tara Singh	22 April	1925	117
134. Telegram to Administrator, Nabha	22 April	1925	118
135. Telegram to Tara Singh	24 April	1925	118
136. To Purshotamdas Thakurdas	27 April	1925	119
137. To Seth Govind Das	28 April	1925	120
138. To Agent, Allahabad Bank	30 April	1925	121
139. To Mushir Husain Kidwai	2 May	1925	121
140. To Ram Lal	7 May	1925	123
141. To Mushir Husain Kidwai	11 May	1925	124
142. To Mohammad Yakub	13 May	1925	125
143. To H. S. L. Polak	14 May	1925	126
144. To Kantilal Parekh	18 May	1925	127
145. To Jawahar	20 May	1925	128
146. To Jawahar	20 May	1925	130
147. To Kantilal Parekh	21 May	1925	131
148. To Jawahar	22 May	1925	131
149. To Jawahar	30 May	1925	133
150. To Purshotamdas Thakurdas	30 May	1925	135
151. To C.F. Andrews	31 May	1925	135
152. To Jawahar	1 June	1925	137
153. To Purshotamdas Thakurdas	25 June	1925	138
154. To Jawahar	2 July	1925	138
155. To E. Burdon	3 July	1925	139
156. To Jawahar	4 July	1925	140
157. To Mahatma Gandhi	21 July	1925	141
158. To Mohamed Ali	28 July	1925	142
159. To J.M. Sen-Gupta	5 August	1925	143
160. To Krishna Ballabh Sahay	8 August	1925	145
161. To J.M. Sen-Gupta	15 August	1925	145
162. To M.R. Jayakar	15 August	1925	146
163. To Govind Ballabh Pant	15 August	1925	147
164. To Jamnatal Bajaj	16 August	1925	150
165. To E. Raghavendra Rao	16 August	1925	150
166. To Kailash Nath Katju	16 August	1925	151
167. To Jawahar	19 August	1925	152
168. To Jawahar	23 August	1925	153
169. To Jawahar	29 August	1925	154
170. To Jawahar	2 September	1925	155
171. To Jawahar	14 September	1925	156
172. To Maharaja of Nabha	26 September	1925	158
173. To M.R. Jayakar	29 September	1925	159
174. To Lalji Naranji	30 September	1925	161
175. To Purshotamdas Thakurda	30 September	1925	162
176. To Kantilal Parekh	30 September	1925	162
177. To T. Prakasam	1 October	1925	163

178. To T.H. Thorne	1 October	1925	164
179. To Mohammad Ismail Khan	2 October	1925	164
180. To C. Vijayaraghavachariar	4 October	1925	165
181. To Kantilal Parekh	8 October	1925	166
182. To M.R. Jayakar	12 October	1925	166
183. To Seth Govind Das	13 October	1925	167
184. To Maharaja Ripudaman Singh	14 October	1925	168
185. To C.S. Ranga Iyer	15 October	1925	169
186. To M.R. Jayakar	22 October	1925	170
187. To Purshotamdas Thakurdas	26 October	1925	172
188. To Maulvi Shafec	26 October	1925	172
189. To Krishna Ballabh Sahay	26 October	1925	173
190. To the Editor	29 October	1925	173
191. To Jawahar	5 November	1925	174
192. Telegram to K.F. Nariman	14 November	1925	175
193. To T.C. Goswami	23 November	1925	175
194. To K.F. Nariman	23 November	1925	176
195. To Mahatma Gandhi	25 November	1925	176
196. To N.M. Joshi	27 November	1925	177
197. To Jawahar	6 December	1925	178

*Writings and Speeches, 1923-25*

198. An Amendment by Motilal Nehru	183
199. The Swaraj Party, 9 March 1923	184
200. On District Board Elections, 31 March 1923	186
201. Election Campaign not to be Interrupted, 2 May 1923	187
202. Appeal to Hindus and Muslims, 23 July 1923	188
203. Reply to an address by the Municipal Board, Lucknow, 16 August 1923	189
204. Reply to an address by the Kanpur Municipality, 20 August 1923	191
205. Election Manifesto of the Swaraj Party, 14 October 1923	192
206. A Notice from Swaraj Party, 26 December 1923	198
207. Resolution at Cocanada Congress, 29 December 1923	198
208. Speech at Cocanada Congress, 29 December 1923	198
209. Speech at Cocanada Congress, 29 December 1923	201
210. Speech at Cocanada Congress, 1 January 1924	203
211. Achievements of Swaraj Party, 13 April 1924	204
212. Criticism of the Government of India Act, 18 April 1924	211
213. Note on Council-entry	217
214. Speech at AICC meeting, Ahmedabad on Gandhi's Resolution, 28 June 1924	223
215. Speech at Unveiling Ceremony of Lokamanya Tilak's Statue, 27 July 1924	223
216. Programme of the Swaraj Party, 1 August 1924	230
217. Speech in Calcutta, 16 August 1924	231
218. Reply to an address by the Calcutta Corporation, 18 August 1924	236

219. A Remark about Lord Lytton's Comment, 19 August 1924	238
220. Appeal for National Celebration, 3 October 1924	238
221. Suggestions for Union of All Parties	238
222. General Council of the Swaraj Party	239
223. Meeting at Belgaum	239
224. Hindu-Muslim Question, 12 December 1924	239
225. Speech at Belgaum Congress, 26 December 1924	241
226. Speech at Belgaum Congress, 27 December 1924	243
227. Vote of thanks at Belgaum Congress, 27 December 1924	245
228. Appeal to the Country on behalf of the Swaraj Party	246
229. On Hindu-Muslim Rapprochement, 12 January 1925	248
230. A Note for the Swaraj Party	250
231. Parties in the Assembly and their Work—I	251
232. Parties in the Assembly and their Work—II	254
233. Parties in the Assembly and their Work—III	258
234. Parties in the Assembly and their Work—IV	261
235. Reply to an Address	265
236. Resolutions moved at AICC meeting, Patna, 22 September 1925	266
237. On Crisis in the Swaraj Party, 19 October 1925	267
238. On the Question of United Congress, 20 October 1925	270
239. Remarks on Government's statement on Electoral Disqualification, 22 October 1925	271
240. A Plea for Unity, 25 October 1925	272
241. An Appeal for Votes	272
242. Resolution on New Political Programme, 27 December 1925	273
243. Speech at Kanpur Congress, 28 December 1925	276

*Press Statements and Interviews, 1923-25*

244. Bulletin issued to the Press	281
245. Views on the Congress split, 15 January 1923	281
246. Reclamation of Malkanas, 6 April 1923	286
247. Political Offences and Non-cooperators	286
248. Appeal to Congress Delegates, 8 August 1923	287
249. Employment in Japan	288
250. The Swarajist Programme, 28 December 1923	288
251. Views on Cocanada Congress	289
252. Comment on Interview with Mahatma Gandhi, 27 February 1924	291
253. Nationalisation of Steel Industry, 20 May 1924	291
254. Comment on Mahatma Gandhi's Statement, 5 June 1924	293
255. 'Homage' to Gopinath Saha, 10 June 1924	295
256. Statement on Bengal Ordinance, 30 October 1924	296
257. Views on Bengal Ordinance and Arrests, 10 November 1924	300
258. Invitation for Bombay Conference	303
259. Views on All Parties Conference, 1 December 1924	304
260. On Communal Relations	306
261. Views on New Franchise, 26 December 1924	308
262. Views on Swaraj Party vs Government Offices	309

263. On Deliberations in All Parties Conference, 2 February 1925	310
264. Comment on Lord Birkenhead's Speech, 10 July 1925	310
265. On his Health, 11 July 1925	312
266. Statement on his joining Indian Sandhurst Committee, 27 July 1925	312
267. Statement on Das-Lytton Negotiations	313
268. On Tambe's Appointment to the Governor's Executive Council, C.P. and Berar, 10 October 1925	318
269. Views on Tambe's Appointment, 15 October 1925	318
270. Statement on Tambe Affair, 17 October 1925	318
271. Meeting of the General Council of the Swaraj Party, 21 October 1925	320

*Debates: Legislative Assembly, 1924-25*

272. Grant of Full Self-Governing Dominion Status to India, 8 February 1924	323
273. Grant of Full Self-Governing Dominion Status to India, 13 February 1924	332
274. Greetings of the Assembly to the Labour Party, 14 February 1924	338
275. Grant of Full Self-Governing Dominion Status to India, 18 February 1924	339
276. Muhammadan Representation, 19 February 1924	340
277. Return to India of B.G. Horniman, 19 February 1924	342
278. The Budget—List of Demands, 10 March 1924	344
279. On the Death of G.M. Bhurgri, 11 March 1924	353
280. Statement of the Position of the Nationalist Party in Regard to the Demands for Grants, 11 March 1924	353
281. The Indian Finance Bill, 17 March 1924	354
282. The Indian Finance Bill, 18 March 1924	362
283. Abolition of the Cotton Excise, 20 March 1924	364
284. The Steel Industry (Protection) Bill, 2 June 1924	366
285. The Steel Industry (Protection) Bill, 4 June 1924	367
286. The Steel Industry (Protection) Bill, 5 June 1924	371
287. Recommendations of the Lee Commission, 10 September 1924	373
288. The Hindu Religious and Charitable Trusts Bill, 16 September 1924	390
289. The Indian Criminal Law Amendment (Repealing) Bill, 16 September 1924	392
290. On the Death of Bhupendra Nath Basu, 16 September 1924	395
291. Substitution of Economic for Taxation Inquiry Committee, 22 September 1924	395
292. The Indian Criminal Law Amendment (Repealing) Bill, 23 September 1924	396
293. The Bengal Criminal Law Amendment Ordinance, 5 February 1925	398
294. The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill, 10 February 1925	413
295. The Legislative Assembly (President's Salary) Bill, 11 February 1925	414
296. Establishment of a Supreme Court in India, 17 February 1925	416
297. The Legislative Assembly (President's Salary) Bill, 18 February 1925	417

298. Establishment of a Military College, 19 February 1925	418
299. The Railway Budget—List of Demands, 25 February 1925	421
300. The Railway Budget—List of Demands, 27 February 1925	430
301. The General Budget—List of Demands, 6 March 1925	431
302. The General Budget—List of Demands, 12 March 1925	435
303. The General Budget—List of Demands, 13 March 1925	436
304. The General Budget—List of Demands, 14 March 1925	436
305. The Indian Finance Bill, 16 March 1925	445
306. The Indian Finance Bill, 17 March 1925	446
307. The Indian Finance Bill, 18 March 1925	447
308. The Special Laws Repeal Bill, 19 March 1925	454
309. The Indian Finance Bill, 21 March 1925	455
310. The Bengal Criminal Law Amendment (Supplementary) Bill, 23 March 1925	455
311. The Bengal Criminal Law Amendment (Supplementary) Bill, 24 March 1925	459
312. On the deaths of C.R. Das and Surendranath Banerjea, 22 August 1925	460
313. Valedictory Speech for the retiring President, 24 August 1925	461
314. Welcome to the new President, 24 August 1925	462
315. Motion for Adjournment, 25 August 1925	462
316. The Indian Registration (Amendment) Bill, 26 August 1925	464
317. The Contempt of Courts Bill, 27 August 1925	465
318. Recommendations of the Reforms Inquiry Committee, 7 September 1925	466

## APPENDICES

### *Appendix I: Joint Statements*

1. Hindu-Muslim Conference	487
2. Congress Leaders' Statement on the Punjab Situation	489
3. Swaraj Party Leaders' Statement	495
4. Statement on Inter-Communal Unity	496
5. Letter to the Elected Members	503
6. Telegram to Mahatma Gandhi	504
7. Statement on Council-entry by C.R. Das and Motilal Nehru	504
8. Invitation for a Round Table Conference	508
9. Agreement between Mahatma Gandhi, Motilal Nehru and C.R. Das	508
10. Statement by Motilal Nehru and Abul Kalam Azad on the Hindu- Muslim dispute at Nagpur, 13 January 1925	510
11. Views on failure to achieve Hindu-Muslim Accord	511
12. An Appeal for All India Deshabandhu Memorial	512

### *Appendix II: Miscellaneous Items*

13. A Note on Khaddar	515
14. Swaraj Party meeting at Allahabad	517
15. The Swaraj Party	520



16. Meeting of the General Council of the Swaraj Party at Cocanada	521
17. Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Swaraj Party at Nagpur	526
18. Views on Annie Besant's Statement	529

### *Appendix III: Enclosures to Letters*

1. Letter from Taraknath Das to Motilal Nehru	531
2. Telegram to Kamlapat Singhania and Tejpal Jannadas and Kamlapat's reply	532
3. Memorandum for Bombay Councillors	533
4. Detail of Remittances	534
5. Draft Proposals	535
6. Draft Resolution	538
7. Letter from Chowdhri Jai Narain Singh to Mohanlal Saksena	539
8. Proposed Resolutions for the U.P. Legislative Council, 15 December 1924	539
9. Copies of Telegrams	540
10. Swaraj Party Resolutions	541
11. Statement on behalf of Muslims and Hindus of Nagpur	542
12. Report of the Swaraj Sub-Committee to the General Committee of the All Parties Conference	543
13. Letter to the Editor (extract)	548

<i>Chronology</i>	551
-------------------	-----

<i>Index</i>	555
--------------	-----

## PREFACE

It gives us great pleasure to present the fourth volume of *Selected Works of Motilal Nehru* which covers the years 1923-25.

The contents of this volume touch upon a phase of the Indian national struggle in which Motilal Nehru played an important role. With the collapse of the non-cooperation movement in 1922, it was necessary that a new direction be given to the popular desire for freedom from British rule. Motilal Nehru, in association with C. R. Das and other nationalist leaders, met this need by organising the Swaraj Party, which fought the battle for freedom in the central and provincial legislatures during the years covered in this volume.

In preparing the fourth volume, we have examined relevant materials in various archival repositories and libraries. The Motilal Nehru Papers in our possession constituted a basic source. Equally rich were the national and regional newspapers of this period, which yielded speeches and statements not available elsewhere. In the present volume, we have made minimum editorial interventions.

Finally, we would like to thank our colleagues, particularly, Mr S. R. Mahajan, Miss Deepa Bhatnagar, Mrs Indrani Henderson, Mrs Aruna Tandon, Miss Amrit Varsha Gandhi and Mr S. K. Sharma who helped us prepare the volume.

1 August 1986

RAVINDER KUMAR  
HARI DEV SHARMA

1. To W.S. Mukadam<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
9.1.23

Dear Mr. Mukadam,<sup>2</sup>

I am glad to receive your letter of the 6th instant and have as requested registered your name as a member of our Party.

The suggestions you have made specially those about *Khaddar* and *Charkha* have already been adopted as essential by Deshbandhu Das and myself and you may be sure that they will be strictly adhered to. To remove all misapprehension about *Khaddar* I have given instructions for a design of the seal of our Party in which the *Charkha* will appear prominently. You need have no fear on the score of *Khaddar* going down by reason of the formation of our Party. We shall take care to frame and work our programme in such a manner as will create a healthy spirit of emulation in both the parties and each will try to excel the other in producing and popularising *Khaddar*.

Gujarat is groaning under the tyranny of the No-Change Party and I have received several complaints that they have made it impossible for any one to think for himself and express his views openly. It will be necessary to begin an intensive propaganda in that stronghold of blind orthodoxy as soon as the more reasonable Provinces have been organised. Meanwhile it is for you and other sympathisers of the Young movement to prepare the ground by weaning as many persons from the prevailing slave mentality as possible.

I have noted the names you mention but I do not think it will be any use inviting the No-Change Party at the discussion of our programme of work. They can only prove a hinderance at such discussions where unbelievers have no place. They will be tackled later on when we are in full working gear.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

Sjt. W.S. Mukadam,  
Godhra,  
Distt. Panch Mahal,  
Gujarat

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers

<sup>2</sup>Waman Sitaram Mukadam, b. 1885; participated in the Home Rule movement; Secretary, first Gujarat Political Conference, Godhra, 1917; Chief Whip of the Swaraj Party in the Bombay Legislative Council, 1924-30, led a batch of volunteers to Dharasana in 1930 and sentenced to imprisonment for a year and a half; Chief Whip of the Congress in the Bombay Legislative Assembly, 1947-50; d. 1950.

judge in place of Rafique<sup>1</sup>, resigned. This will show the kind of rest I am having. I have not mentioned the more agreeable, visitors who motor round every evening from Anand Bhawan to minister to my wants. They are Kamla, Betty, Indu, Ranjit & Nikkoo.

I went direct to Banares after seeing you on the 5th. Kamla & Indu returning to Allahabad with Nikkoo—spent the 6th with Das & arrived home on the 7th in time to attend a meeting of the shareholders of the Nationalist Journals Ltd. at which the requisite proportion of share capital to constitute a quorum was represented by me and there were two other shareholders present viz. Ladli & Kailasnath. The usual annual business of a formal nature was transacted and for the rest things were left to adjust themselves according to developments. On the 8th & 9th I had informal meetings of sorts chiefly of an organizing character. This is the full history of my doings since I saw you last. The future programme so far as I know includes a visit to Bombay about the 20th, the January interview with you on return from Bombay sometime during the last week of the month, a meeting of the full U.P. Committee on the 4th Feb. and the big meeting of the Party about the same time. Immediately after the last meeting will come the Provincial and All India tours—so good bye to rest & change for some months to come.

It is quite possible that I may not be able to return from the Bombay side in time for the January interview in which case Kamla etc. will see you. But unless something very important detains me I shall make a point of availing myself of the next interview.

Tomorrow is the great *Magh Sankranti* festival. Kamla, Betty, Indu, Ranjit, Nikkoo, Shamji and family are coming here early in the morning. I have hired a boat for the period of my stay at Rambagh & we shall all glide in it down the river to the Tribeni & have a view of the whole mela. The return journey will be made by the road as the boat will take quite six hours to be pulled up. It is now 10 p.m. I shall finish this letter tomorrow on the boat.

Anand Bhawan  
14.1.23

We have just come back from the mela. It was a poor gathering at the time we arrived (2.30) 5 hours from Rambagh to Tribeni down the river. The outing was not so successful as we thought it would be . . .

The books you have asked for will be sent with Harkaran if he turns up before leaving for Lucknow tonight. I hope the two books we left for you the other day have been delivered to you.

I cannot think of anything else to write about, and am anxiously waiting for your letter which I expect will give a more satisfactory account of the

<sup>1</sup>Syed Muhammad Rafique; b. 1863, Bar-at-law, practised at Aligarh, Rae Bareilly and Lucknow; joined Subordinate Judicial Service in Oudh; District and Sessions Judge, 1909; Additional Judicial Commissioner, Oudh, 1911; Puisne Judge, Allahabad High Court, 1912-23, member, Secretary of State's Council, 1925-29, d. 1929.

2. To Jawahar<sup>1</sup>

Ram Bagh

Allahabad

13.1.23

My dear Jawahar,

I have underlined the above address to draw your particular attention to the fact that by the hospitality of Bachoji I am supposed to be having a rest in his delightful river-side garden. I moved here on the afternoon of the 10th but omitted to give specific instructions that my whereabouts were not to be disclosed to all & sundry. For this omission I paid the sine of receiving visitors almost the whole day & far into the night of the 11th. The last to come was Mr. B R. Bomanji<sup>2</sup> of Saharanpur who turned up in a rickety tonga at about 9 p.m. cursing & swearing all round. The *chowkidar* of Anand Bhawan had informed him that Ram Bagh was half a mile away and acting on this information he had ignored the protests and entreaties of the tonga driver. You can easily imagine the language he must have used. He entered the room rubbing his hands which he pitiously pleaded were frozen with cold. I had nothing stronger than tea to offer him much to his disappointment. On the 12th I was dragged away to attend a meeting of the U.P. Committee Council and this morning Ram Bagh was invaded by a number of lawyers, agents etc. for my Examination as a witness on Commission. This was in the case of Rani Phul Kumari<sup>3</sup> of Dhampur whose offer of a lakh of Rupees to appear on her behalf was refused by me last year. She had been advised by me in 1912 on this very matter and I was to be examined on the opinion I then gave in writing. The Examination lasted from 10.30 to noon. Among the Counsel were G.W. Dillon<sup>4</sup> and Sulaiman.<sup>5</sup> The latter has now been appointed a permanent

<sup>1</sup>Jawaharlal Nehru Papers.

<sup>2</sup>B.R. Bomanji; b. [1860]; leading Barrister of Saharanpur; a close friend of the Nehrus. Freemason; Founder-Member, Comrades Lodge, Saharanpur; member, A.I.C.C., 1918; unsuccessfully contested election to the U.P. Legislative Council in 1920. Chairman, Municipal Board, Saharanpur, 1926, d. 1936.

<sup>3</sup>Rani Phul Kumari of Dhampur, b. 1899 at Najibabad, Bijnor district, U.P.; married Chaudhary Ranjit Singh, 1904, received the title of Rani, 1923; member, Board of Health, Government of India, 1937-43, Vice-Chairman, Rural Development Association, Bijnor, 1938-42, President, U.P. Women's Conference, 1938; elected to the U.P. Legislative Council in 1940 and became Deputy Leader of the Opposition; member, Provincial War Board and Civil Defence, 1941, M.B.E., 1941, Founder and Life President, R.S.M. Inter College, Dhampur, Vice-President, U.P. Hindu Mahasabha; d. 1972.

<sup>4</sup>George Wentworth Dillon; b. 1877, Bar-at-law; enrolled as an advocate of the Allahabad High Court, 1898, practised on the criminal's side; belonged to a family imbued with legal traditions, his father, grandfather having been distinguished members of the Bar, was appointed Assistant Government Advocate in January 1925 and became Government Advocate after Lalit Mohan Banerjee was elevated to the Bench in March 1925, d. 1927.

<sup>5</sup>Shah Muhammad Sulaiman, b. 1886, joined the Allahabad High Court Bar, 1912; Puisne Judge, 1923, Acting Chief Justice, 1928-29 and 1931-32; Chief Justice, Allahabad High Court, 1932-37; Judge, Federal Court of India, 1937. Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University, 1929-30 and 1938, d. 1941.

judge in place of Rafique<sup>1</sup>, resigned. This will show the kind of rest I am having. I have not mentioned the more agreeable, visitors who motor round every evening from Anand Bhawan to minister to my wants. They are Kamla, Betty, Indu, Ranjit & Nikkoo.

I went direct to Banares after seeing you on the 5th. Kamla & Indu returning to Allahabad with Nikkoo—spent the 6th with Das & arrived home on the 7th in time to attend a meeting of the shareholders of the Nationalist Journals Ltd. at which the requisite proportion of share capital to constitute a quorum was represented by me and there were two other shareholders present viz. Ladli & Kailasnath. The usual annual business of a formal nature was transacted and for the rest things were left to adjust themselves according to developments. On the 8th & 9th I had informal meetings of sorts chiefly of an organizing character. This is the full history of my doings since I saw you last. The future programme so far as I know includes a visit to Bombay about the 20th, the January interview with you on return from Bombay sometime during the last week of the month, a meeting of the full U.P. Committee on the 4th Feb. and the big meeting of the Party about the same time. Immediately after the last meeting will come the Provincial and All India tours—so good bye to rest & change for some months to come.

It is quite possible that I may not be able to return from the Bombay side in time for the January interview in which case Kamla etc. will see you. But unless something very important detains me I shall make a point of availing myself of the next interview.

Tomorrow is the great *Magh Sankrant* festival. Kamla, Betty, Indu, Ranjit, Nikkoo, Shamji and family are coming here early in the morning. I have hired a boat for the period of my stay at Rambagh & we shall all glide in it down the river to the Tribeni & have a view of the whole mela. The return journey will be made by the road as the boat will take quite six hours to be pulled up. It is now 10 p.m. I shall finish this letter tomorrow on the boat.

Anand Bhawan

14.1.23

We have just come back from the mela. It was a poor gathering at the time we arrived (2.30) 5 hours from Rambagh to Tribeni down the river. The outing was not so successful as we thought it would be . . .

The books you have asked for will be sent with Harkaran if he turns up before leaving for Lucknow tonight. I hope the two books we left for you the other day have been delivered to you.

I cannot think of anything else to write about, and am anxiously waiting for your letter which I expect will give a more satisfactory account of the

<sup>1</sup>Syed Muhammad Rafique; b. 1863, Bar-at-law, practised at Aligarh, Rae Bareilly and Lucknow; joined Subordinate Judicial Service in Oudh; District and Sessions Judge, 1909; Additional Judicial Commissioner, Oudh, 1911; Puisne Judge, Allahabad High Court, 1912-23, member, Secretary of State's Council, 1925-29, d. 1929.

2. To Jawahar<sup>1</sup>

Ram Bagh  
Allahabad  
13.1.23

My dear Jawahar,

I have underlined the above address to draw your particular attention to the fact that by the hospitality of Bachoji I am supposed to be having a rest in his delightful river-side garden. I moved here on the afternoon of the 10th but omitted to give specific instructions that my whereabouts were not to be disclosed to all & sundry. For this omission I paid the fine of receiving visitors almost the whole day & far into the night of the 11th. The last to come was Mr. B.R. Bomanji<sup>2</sup> of Saharanpur who turned up in a rickety tonga at about 9 p.m. cursing & swearing all round. The *chowkidar* of Anand Bhawan had informed him that Ram Bagh was half a mile away and acting on this information he had ignored the protests and entreaties of the *tonga* driver. You can easily imagine the language he must have used. He entered the room rubbing his hands which he pitiously pleaded were frozen with cold. I had nothing stronger than tea to offer him much to his disappointment. On the 12th I was dragged away to attend a meeting of the U.P. Committee Council and this morning Ram Bagh was invaded by a number of lawyers, agents etc. for my Examination as a witness on Commission. This was in the case of Rani Phul Kumari<sup>3</sup> of Dhampur whose offer of a lakh of Rupees to appear on her behalf was refused by me last year. She had been advised by me in 1912 on this very matter and I was to be examined on the opinion I then gave in writing. The Examination lasted from 10.30 to noon. Among the Counsel were G.W. Dillon<sup>4</sup> and Sulieman.<sup>5</sup> The latter has now been appointed a permanent

<sup>1</sup>*Jawaharlal Nehru Papers.*

<sup>2</sup>B.R. Bomanji; b. [1860], leading Barrister of Saharanpur; a close friend of the Nehrus, Freemason; Founder-Member, Comrades Lodge, Saharanpur; member, A.I.C.C., 1918; unsuccessfully contested election to the U.P. Legislative Council in 1920, Chairman, Municipal Board, Saharanpur, 1926; d. 1936.

<sup>3</sup>Rani Phul Kumari of Dhampur; b. 1899 at Najabad, Bijnor district, U.P.; married Chaudhary Ranjit Singh, 1904, received the title of Rani, 1923; member, Board of Health, Government of India, 1937-43; Vice-Chairman, Rural Development Association, Bijnor, 1938-42, President, U.P. Women's Conference, 1938; elected to the U.P. Legislative Council in 1940 and became Deputy Leader of the Opposition, member, Provincial War Board and Civil Defence, 1941; M.B.E., 1941; Founder and Life President, R.S.M. Inter College, Dhampur; Vice-President, U.P. Hindu Mahasabha; d. 1972.

<sup>4</sup>George Wentworth Dillon, b. 1877, Bar-at-law; enrolled as an advocate of the Allahabad High Court, 1898; practised on the criminal side; belonged to a family imbued with legal traditions, his father, grandfather having been distinguished members of the Bar; was appointed Assistant Government Advocate in January 1925 and became Government Advocate after Lalit Mohan Banerjee was elevated to the Bench in March 1925, d. 1927.

<sup>5</sup>Shah Muhammad Sulaiman; b. 1886, joined the Allahabad High Court Bar, 1912; Puisne Judge, 1923, Acting Chief Justice, 1928-29 and 1931-32; Chief Justice, Allahabad High Court, 1932-37, Judge, Federal Court of India, 1937, Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University, 1929-30 and 1938; d. 1941.

Syt. Sita Rama,<sup>1</sup> B.A.,  
Vakil,  
Kberī-Lakhimpur,  
Oudh.

5. To Chandan Singh<sup>2</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
31-1-23

Dear Thakur Chandan Singh,

Your letter of the 11th January came duly to hand but I have in this interval been very much worried by the serious illness of my daughter and was unable to reply to it earlier.

It is hardly possible to dispose of the various points you have raised by correspondence and the discussion must be put off till we meet next. Meanwhile I am sending you a reprint of the report of an interview I gave to the Press which may elucidate a few points.

The programme of the Party is being drafted in Bombay and will be finally settled in Allahabad on the 20th February. The Allahabad meeting is intended for members of the Party only but knowing your views as I do I can only regard you as a member in spite of your protestations to the contrary. I hope therefore that you will attend the meeting and I have no doubt that you would go back from Allahabad thoroughly satisfied with the Party and with yourself.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

Thakur Chandan Singh,  
The Palace,  
Saugar, C.P.

<sup>1</sup>Sita Ram; b. 1874 at Baisampur, Pilibhit district, U.P.; educated at Lucknow and Allahabad; Government Pleader and Honorary Assistant Collector; President, District Bar Association, District Congress Committee, Lakhimpur Kheri; President, U.P. Arya Pratinidhi Sabha, and Arya Samaj, Lakhimpur Kheri; Chairman, District Board Education Committee, Lakhimpur Kheri; Honorary Secretary, Lakhimpur Municipal Board; participated in the non-cooperation movement and imprisoned for three months; elected to the U.P. Legislative Council in 1920, resigned, 1922, re-elected in 1923, contested again in 1926 on Swaraj Party ticket but lost to Pandit Sankata Prasad Bajpai of Liberal Party; Founder-Manager, Bhagwandin Arya Kanya Intermediate College, Kheri; d. 1951.

<sup>2</sup>AICC Papers.



action of Sulphur 1000" which I advised you to take.

Your loving  
Father

3 To C V Rajagopalachari<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
29.1.1923

Dear Sir,

I am in receipt of your letter enclosing your note<sup>2</sup> on organisation etc. It will be duly considered by the Council of the Congress-Khilafat Swaraj Party.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

Syt. C V Rajagopalacharry,<sup>3</sup> Vellore.

4. To Sita Ram<sup>4</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
31.1.1923

Dear Sir,

I am sorry your letter of the 12th January has remained unanswered so long as I was very much worried on account of my daughter's illness. Seeing that your views are in the main in favour of the principle on which the new Congress-Khilafat Swaraj Party has been formed I have registered your name as a member, intimation of which has already been given to you. I hope you will attend the meeting of the Party to be held in Allahabad on the 20th\* February when the various points you have raised will be fully discussed and a final programme of work will be framed.

## Correspondence

8. To Dwarka Prasad<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
12-2-1923

Dear Dwarka Prasadji,<sup>2</sup>

Your letter of the 9th. The proceedings of the U.P. Provincial Committee meeting passed off in a very commendable spirit—thanks to the very reasonable attitude of those recently released from the jail.

I am sorry I cannot attend your Conference as I have a lot to do in connection with the meeting of the Congress-Khilafat Swaraj Party to be held here on the 20th instant. Jawaharlal however will be there and I hope your Conference will be a success. He will return here on the 19th and I hope you will either accompany or follow him to attend the meeting on the 20th.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

Syt. Dwarka Prasadji,  
Chairman, Reception Committee,  
Distt. Political Conference,  
Bareilly.

9. To O.M. Chiene<sup>3</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
24-2-1923

Dear Chiene,

The accompanying document is the programme of the Swarajya Party as finally adopted at a meeting of the members held at Anand Bhawan, Allahabad, on the 20th, 21st, and 22nd February 1923. Please wire it to the Press fully today.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

Enclosure: One programme.

O.M. Chiene Esq ,  
10 Elgin Road,  
Allahabad.

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Dwarka Prasad; b. 1891, a zamindar of Bareilly; educated at Muir Central College, Allahabad; Secretary, Town Congress Committee; suffered imprisonment during the non-cooperation movement, Chairman, Bareilly Municipal Board, 1926, Bareilly District Board, 1934; elected to the U.P. Legislative Assembly in 1937, member, Managing Committee, Bareilly College for many years; participated in the individual satyagraha, 1941 and jailed for one year; d. 1946.

<sup>3</sup>AICC Papers.

6. To A M Khwaja<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
3-2-1923

My dear Khwaja<sup>2</sup>

Thanks for your invitation to attend the Convocation. I am going through very anxious times owing to the serious illness of my daughter. She is very much better but not yet convalescent and my mind is not quite at ease. Kindly excuse my absence.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

Syt. A.M. Khwaja Sahab  
Principal,  
Muslim National University  
Aligarh

7. To Duni Chand<sup>3</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
3-2-1923

Dear Lala Duni Chand,<sup>4</sup>

Thanks for your congratulations on my son's release. I am going through very anxious times owing to the serious illness of my daughter.

Hoping to see you on the 20th Feb. the date now fixed for the Party meeting here.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

Lala Duni Chand Sahab  
Barrister-At-Law  
Ambala.

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Abdul Majid Khwaja; b. 1885; a contemporary of Jawaharlal Nehru at Cambridge; Principal, Jamia Millia Islamia, 1921; participated in the non-cooperation and Khilafat movements; convicted in December 1921 for six months. President, All India Muslim Majlis, 1944; Chancellor, Jamia Millia Islamia, 1936-1962; d. 1962.

<sup>3</sup>AICC Papers.

<sup>4</sup>Lala Dunichand, b. 1873, lawyer; joined the non-cooperation movement, 1920; Manager, Anglo Sanskrit High School, Ambala, 1906-21; member, Managing Committee D.A.V. College, Lahore, A.I.C.C., 1921, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1923-26, President, Punjab P.C.C., 1930; member, Congress Working Committee; elected to the Punjab Legislative Assembly in 1937, arrested during the Quit India movement, 1942; retired from active politics after independence; d. 1965.

forthcoming general elections on the following basis:

(a) They will, when they are elected, present on behalf of the country, its legitimate demands as formulated by the Party, as soon as the elections are over and ask for their acceptance and fulfilment, within a reasonable time by the Government.

(b) If the demands are not granted to the satisfaction of the Party, occasion will then arise, for the elected members belonging to the Party, to adopt a policy of uniform, continuous and consistent obstruction within the Councils with a view to make Government through the Councils impossible but before adopting such a policy the representatives of the Party in the Councils will, if necessary, strengthen themselves by obtaining an express mandate of the electorates in this behalf.

(c) Detailed instructions in this behalf will be given by the Party after the elections are over.

(d) In no case will any member of the Party accept Office.

VI. The Party will contest elections to Local and Municipal Boards in the several Provinces with a view to secure the control of Nationalists over Local and Municipal affairs.

VII. The Party will take steps to organise Labour in the country, industrial as well as agricultural, including ryots and peasants, with a view to protect and promote its interests and enable it to take its proper place in the country's struggle for Swarajya.

VIII. The Party will frame a plan for the boycott of selected British goods on the advice of a Sub-Committee, and bring it into operation as a political weapon in the pursuit of its aim.

IX. The Party will accord its full support in such manner as it thinks necessary, to the carrying out of the Constructive Programme of the Congress in relation to Swadeshi, *Khaddar*, Temperance, Untouchability, Inter-communal unity and the promotion of National Education and Arbitration Courts and will also endeavour to increase the number of members on the Congress rolls.

X. The Party will take immediate steps, as a temporary measure and until greater National solidarity is achieved, to promote the formation of what may be called 'The Indian National Pact' in the several Provinces, by means of which all reasonable communal claims may be guaranteed and disputes and differences may be settled, in order that the attainment of the Nation's freedom may be facilitated. The Lucknow Pact will generally govern communal representation as between Hindus and Moslems, and efforts will be made to bring about a similar understanding regarding the claims and interests of other communities like the Sikhs, Parsis, Jews, Indian Christians (including domiciled Anglo-Indians), the Non-Brahmins and Depressed Classes in the several Provinces.

XI. The Party will take steps for India to participate in the formation of a Federation of Asiatic countries and Nationalities with a view to secure the solidarity of Asiatic Nations, to promote Asiatic culture, and mutual help in the matter of trade and commerce.

XII. The Party will take steps, to start, maintain, revive and reorganise the agencies of foreign propaganda for Indian affairs, with special reference to

*Whereas* this party within the Congress was formed and constituted at Gaya on the 31st December 1922;

*And whereas* by its manifesto bearing the said date it accepted the creed of the Congress viz the attainment of Swarajya by all legitimate and peaceful means;

*And whereas* by the said manifesto it further accepted the principle of non-violent, non-cooperation as guiding and shaping its activity but with determination to apply it rationally and to prevent the said principle from degenerating into a lifeless dogma;

Now this Party declares that that policy of Non-Violent Non-Cooperation shall include on the one hand all such activity which stands to create an atmosphere of resistance making Government by the Bureaucracy impossible with a view to enforce our National claim and vindicate our National honour, and on the other hand it shall include for the said purpose all steps necessary for the gradual withdrawal of that cooperation by the people of this country without which it is impossible for the Bureaucracy to maintain itself.

*And whereas* it is further necessary to define the attitude of this Party to the question of Civil Disobedience;

Now this Party makes the following declaration:—

That whilst fully accepting Civil Disobedience as a legitimate weapon which must be used and applied when the country is prepared and the occasion demands, it recognizes that such Disobedience can only be based on the obligation to obey higher law and determines that the application of Civil Disobedience must depend on the vivid realization of such duty by the people of the country and the attitude of the Bureaucracy with regard to such realization; that in the opinion of the Party the country is not at present ready for such Civil Disobedience but that in the course of the work of this Party according to the programme which is heremaster set out this Party would conceive it to be its duty whenever such occasion would arise to resort to such Civil Disobedience as the circumstances may then demand.

*And whereas* it is necessary to frame a detailed programme of work in pursuance of the principle above enumerated,

Now this Party resolves upon the following programme that is to say:—

I. The goal of the Party is the attainment of Swarajya.

II. The Scheme of Swarajya prepared by Syts. Chittaranjan Das and Bhagwan Das be circulated, that opinions be invited, and that a Committee consisting of the said two gentlemen be appointed to collect the opinions submitted to them or expressed in the country, and the said Committee do submit their Scheme of Swarajya after a full consideration of such opinions to this Party within six months from now.

III. The immediate objective of the Party is the speedy attainment of the full Dominion Status that is the securing of the right to frame a Constitution adopting such machinery and system as are most suited to the conditions of the country and to the genius of the people.

IV. The Party will formulate definite programme of organising and instructing the electors of the Legislatures in the country.

V. The Party will set up Nationalist candidates throughout the country to contest and secure the seats in the Legislative Councils and Assembly at the

Council are to be retained in the Province to be disposed of as directed by the Provincial Council when duly constituted.

3. Organization of the Provincial Council as soon as a sufficient number of members has enrolled to be notified to the General Secretary not later than the 20th March 1923.

The Provincial Council when duly elected will at once proceed:

(a) To appoint the Provincial Executive Council.

(b) To elect 2 members from the Province to the General Council other than those who are members of the All India Congress Committee and as such entitled under the Constitution to be *ex-officio* members of the General Council. The names of such elected members together with those of the members of the All India Committee in your Province who have joined the Party should be communicated to me not later than the 20th March 1923.

(c) To constitute subordinate Party organization, if any, in the Province and notify the same to the General Secretary before the 5th April.

Printed copies of the Programme and Constitution of the Party will be sent to you in a day or two. Meanwhile I hope you will appreciate the necessity of beginning the work outlined above without loss of time.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru  
General Secretary

the dissemination of accurate information and the securing of the sympathy and support of foreign countries in this country's struggle for Swarajya.

#### 10. To M.R. Jayakar<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
2.3.1923

Dear Sir,

At a meeting of the Party held at Anand Bhawan, Allahabad- on the 28th February 1923 you were appointed Organiser on behalf of the Party along with Syt. Jamnadas Mehta<sup>2</sup> for the Province of Bombay and your appointment has been announced in the press. Among the duties you have to perform as such Organiser are:

1. Immediate collection of Party Funds of which Rs 5,000 has been allotted to your Province for the initial expenses of the Central Organization and should be remitted to me or to the Provisional Treasurers of the Party Syts. Seth Govind Das<sup>3</sup> and Shyam Sundar Bhargava<sup>4</sup> of Jubbulpore before the end of March 1923. The excess over your contribution to the general initial expenses is to be retained in your Province subject to the payment of such part or proportion to the General Council as may hereafter be determined by the Executive Council.

2. Enrolment of Congressmen in your Province as members of the Party and realization of subscriptions (Rs 3 annually) from them. The names and addresses of the members from your Province already registered in the Head Office are entered in a separate list herewith attached. They have not yet paid their subscriptions and you will have to realize the same. All subscriptions except those received from ordinary or ex-officio members of the General

<sup>1</sup>M.R. Jayakar Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Jamnadas Madhavji Mehta; b. 1884, Bar-at-law; member, A.I.C.C., 1921-31; President, Maharashtra P.C.C., 1921-23, Bombay P.C.C., 1929-30; member, Bombay Corporation, 1922-48, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1923-30, 1941-45, National Defence Council, 1941-45; President, All India Railwaymen's Federation, 1931-44 and Indian Federation of Labour, 1941-44, Indian Workers' delegate, International Labour Conference, Geneva, 1934, 1944, Mayor of Bombay, 1936-37; Revenue and Finance Minister in D B. Cooper Ministry, April-July 1937; Government representative to Burma, 1944-46; d. 1955.

<sup>3</sup>Seth Govind Das, b. 1896, joined the national movement in 1920 and suffered imprisonment several times; member, A.I.C.C., 1920-74 and Congress Working Committee, 1950-51, 53, Chairman, Reception Committee, Tripuri Congress session, 1939, member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1923-25, 1934-47, Council of State, 1925-29, Constituent Assembly, 1946-50, Provisional Parliament, 1950-52, Lok Sabha, 1952-74, appointed Speaker *pro-tem* by the President for the Second, Third, Fourth and Fifth Lok Sabha; President, Mahakoshal P.C.C., 1928-34, 1946-57, Madhya Pradesh P.C.C., 1957, d. 1974.

<sup>4</sup>Shyam Sunder Bhargava; b. 1890, came into contact with Mahatma Gandhi, 1921; formed Rashtra Seva Limited; Chairman, Jabalpur Municipality, 1921; member, C.P. and Berar Legislative Council, 1926-30, took part in the Hartal movement, 1934, joined Hindu Mahasabha; President, Hukarini Sabha, Jabalpur; d. 1941.

that the proposed understanding was unacceptable to Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel<sup>1</sup> and Seth Jamnalal Bajaj, and the compromise has failed.

There are however certain Congressmen who are still building hopes of an amicable settlement on the meeting of the All India Committee notified for the 25th May at Bombay. I earnestly beseech them to waste no more time in the pursuit of a phantasm. It is now abundantly clear that the only possible compromise between the two parties must permit entry into the Councils either by the withdrawal or suspension of the boycott. The alternative offered at Gaya has been tried and has failed. I can conceive of no arrangement acceptable to the Swarajya Party which ignores this obvious fact, and can confidently assert that whatever happens the Party will not desist from contesting the forthcoming elections. This being so what is the clear duty of every member of the Party? I go further and ask what is the clear duty of every true Congressman? Is this the time to wait and look on while the moderates and hangers-on of the Bureaucracy are putting forth strenuous efforts to give the country another three years of Government by mock parliaments?

I have no desire to enter into a discussion of the merits and demerits of capturing the Councils. The question has been discussed threadbare and we have now seen the failure of the only possible alternative suggested. It will however not be out of place here to give you the impression I gathered in the Punjab. I have no doubt in my own mind that the Punjab Council is to a very great extent responsible for the communal differences which have arisen in that Province. You have only to glance through the reports of the interpellations and debates to see how that Council has day after day and month after month been busily feeding the fire of communal disputes for the last three years. Are you going to let the flame envelop the other Provinces as well by leaving them to the tender mercies of the existing type of the Councils for another term? Indications are not wanting that several districts in the U.P. have already been more or less affected by the happenings in the Punjab. I should have thought that collective individual Civil Disobedience was quite out of the question at a time when the whole of a large Province was rent with communal disputes culminating in bloodshed. Chauri Chaura was but a sudden outburst of mob frenzy in a small out of the way village. The causes of the Punjab trouble lie deep and are showing themselves in a sustained and determined hostility between two great communities numbering millions.

I am addressing this letter to all members of the All India Committee and of the Provincial Committees of the various Provinces as I take them to be the selected representatives of the Congress in the country. I divide them into the following groups:—

1. Those who have already joined the Swarajya Party.
2. Those who were ready to join the Party but were kept back by the compromise of the 28th February last.

<sup>1</sup>Vallabhbhai Patel, b. 1875, started legal practice in Ahmedabad, 1913, entered public life as an associate of Mahatma Gandhi, came into prominence as a leader of Kheda satyagraha; President, Gujarat P.C.C., 1921-46, Ahmedabad Municipality, 1924-28, led the no-tax campaign in Bardoli, 1928, President, Karachi session of the Congress, 1931; Chairman, Congress Parliamentary Sub-Committee, 1935-40; Minister, Interim Government, 1946; Deputy Prime Minister, India, and Minister for Home Affairs and States, 1947-50; d. 1950.



volunteers would create the requisite mental and spiritual atmosphere needed for *Civil Disobedience* of the right sort. Unfortunately the day we were looking forward to has not arrived. Our friends have failed to get the men and money they counted upon and the unique experiment has not been tried for want of adequate material within the stipulated time. Disappointing as the result of this great endeavour to achieve its aim has been, it is impossible to suppress a feeling of keener disappointment at the thought of what might have been, if only the time, energy and money spent had been employed in a united effort to prepare the country to capture the Councils. Can there be any reasonable doubt that all the Councils in the country would to-day have been at the feet of the Congress to be dealt with, as the Congress pleased? Has not the result of the recent Municipal elections in the U.P. achieved by a minimum of joint effort a lesson of its own to teach?

Turning to the work of the Swarajya Party during this period we find that prominent members have given their time and attention whole-heartedly to the general Congress work studiously keeping the Party entirely in the background. Mr. C.R. Das and I have spent most of the time in the Punjab and Hakim Ajmal Khan has, despite his failing health, not only rendered valuable services to the Aligarh National University, but has never failed to answer the call for the Punjab in its hour of need. The compromise only suspended Council propaganda and reserved to both parties, full "liberty to work the remaining items of their respective programmes in the interval without interfering with each other". It was however felt that nothing should be done to embarrass the other party in the work they had laid out for themselves, and all party propaganda was severely eschewed. This had the unfortunate effect of cooling down the enthusiasm of our organizers, the great majority of whom failed to carry out the very specific instructions given to them to establish provincial and district committees and complete the necessary spade work before the 30th April.

I regret to have to say that so far from doing any practical good to either party the Compromise of the 28th February has materially prejudiced both. The idea has taken root among Congressmen and the general public, that some similar or more permanent arrangement between the two parties will soon be effected. The terms of likely compromises have from time to time been discussed among both responsible and irresponsible people, the effect of which in my opinion has been disastrous to the whole movement. The expectation of an early coalition in the minds of the workers and the public has induced habits of sloth and given rise to an inclination to wait and see how things will take their final shape. As I have said elsewhere the constant talk of compromise has relieved the people of the necessity of thinking for themselves. They have left all the thinking to the leaders and are occupying themselves with the innocent pastime of breaking each others heads.

The fact that a basis for a fresh understanding between the parties was arrived at in Delhi, the other day has already been announced in the press and is public property. It is my duty, involving in my opinion no breach of confidence, to relieve the public mind of the suspense caused by that announcement. Mr. Rajagopalachari has now wired from Ahmedabad to Mr. C.R. Das

"mend or end the Councils." Can you imagine for a moment that the U.P. agriculturist will be persuaded by the siren voice of the moderate or the somber accents of the no-changer to grant a fresh lease of life to a Council which, by passing the Tenancy Act, has delivered him to the tender mercies of the Talukdar and the Zemindar? If you can, allow me to say that you do not know what is passing in his mind. Take it from me who have been listening to his grievances during the last two years that he is a highly practical person and is no longer to be led away from hard facts by any inducement. Besides, are we not as much of the Congress as the no-changers? Assuming without admitting that we will not succeed in taking a very large number of voters to the polls can you doubt that at least ten times the number which attended at the last election will gladly support us. I assure you that your nervousness is wholly unjustified and beseech you to save the Congress even at this eleventh hour. Allow another month to pass by and you will again be in the grip of the very Councils which have faithfully carried out the behests of the Bureaucracy and helplessly looked on while autocracy ruled the land.

I have addressed this letter to you all as I believe that the real dichards are but few, and the great bulk of the Gaya majority is composed of the other groups I have mentioned. Do not continue to delude yourselves with the hope of a common understanding either at the next meeting of the All India Committee or at any other time in the near future. As at present advised Mr. Das, Hakim Ajmal Khan and I do not intend going to Bombay for the All India Congress Committee meeting. We do not think our joining this meeting will serve any useful purpose. I beg of you to throw off the spell, think for yourselves and come to a final decision without running further risks.

May I expect to hear from you on the subject at an early date?

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

Anand Bhawan  
Allahabad  
May 1st, 1923

## 12. To the Editor<sup>1</sup>

I am sorry that for want of adequate reporting arrangements the speeches made in the various towns, visited by me during the last fortnight, were not taken down extensively, and the summaries which have appeared in the press from time to time are entirely misleading on some important points. The

<sup>1</sup>The Leader, 30 August 1923.

3. Those who did not believe in the Gaya resolution on Civil Disobedience but were desirous of giving the majority who supported it a fair chance of carrying it out.

4. Those who were against dividing the Congress under any circumstances quite apart from their own personal inclinations.

5. Those who did believe in the Gaya resolution but have now seen that it would not work.

6. The waverers.

7. The diehards or those who will not countenance any change in the original N.C.O. programme whatever the circumstances may be and however much the public may be disinclined to follow it.

I have nothing to say to the last group as it is impossible to expect them to see things as I do. To the other groups I have a word to say.

I put it to those in the first three and the sixth groups whether it is not past high time to be up and doing? Have you not by this time seen enough to dispel all your doubts and misgivings? Our friends are evidently anxious to keep their word and bring about some sort of Civil Disobedience as soon as possible. You have seen the Jubbulpore incident in connection with the National flag and are no doubt aware of a similar venture being contemplated at Nagpur. I confess I do not appreciate either the appropriateness or the utility of these undertakings. The net result will in my opinion be the temporary loss of the valuable services of some of the most ardent workers. Another idea has struck some of our friends in the South. They are going to disobey the Finance Act imposing the enhanced salt tax, but it is not stated how it is to be done. To an ordinary man of affairs, it seems that the tax not being a direct one the only way to withhold it is either to engage in the illicit manufacture of salt on the extensive sea board of India or else to smuggle it into our bazars. Do you take any of these proposals seriously? If not what else do you expect in the way of immediate Civil Disobedience? I have not heard or read of any other suggestion and the anxious enquiries I have made on the subject have only met with evasive answers from the leading exponents of the doctrine.

Those of you whom I have classed in groups 4 and 5 will pardon me if I say that I do not understand your position. You think that the prestige of the Congress will suffer by a division among its ranks. But the division is there already and will not be removed by your backing the wrong party. And may I ask in all seriousness whether the prestige of the Congress is likely to be enhanced by the sort of civil disobedience I have just referred to? Some of you are very nervous about the results of the Council elections if they are not run by and in the name of the Congress. You instance the success of the Municipal elections in the U.P. as showing the great weight which the name of the Congress carries with the multitude and draw from it the illogical inference that the name of the Swarajya Party will not carry any weight if the elections are opposed in the name of the Congress. Need I remind you that the converse of every proposition is not true, and that the influence of the Swarajya Party with the masses has not yet been tried? I cannot conceive how people who had the bitter taste of the last Council Government can for a moment hesitate to throw in their lot with the party which approaches them with the election cry

expect all political parties to take the same route, the next best thing obviously is to avoid or at least minimise the chance of collision by each party following its own route without crossing that of any other party. But the painful truth is that the very reverse is being done.

I shall confine myself today to the all important question of Hindu-Muslim unity reserving the question of Congress parties for tomorrow. It is impossible to conceive any point upon which an apparent unanimity presents so many real differences of opinion, sentiment and outlook. Ask any man in the street and he will at once tell you that it is impossible to obtain Swarajya unless and until the Hindus and Muslims come to a complete understanding between themselves and present a united front to the bureaucracy. Yet we find that each community is doing all it can to keep itself as far apart from the other as possible. This can only be due to the fact that either community as a whole has not imbibed the true spirit of toleration and compromise and is full of suspicion and distrust of the other. I wish I were wrong in this poor estimate of the real depth of Hindu-Muslim unity as it exists today. But it will serve no useful purpose to shut one's eyes to solid though ugly facts and proclaim to the world that we are a completely united people when there are forces at work seriously threatening our national existence.'

It will be apparent from the above that the sentences in question were spoken with sole reference to political parties and that I specially had in mind the newly formed parties within the Congress and not the Hindu-Muslim disputes which were dealt with later. After the remarks I have quoted I made a personal reference to my own position in relation to both the communities and proceeded to say:—

'It is evident that real friendship and fellow feeling come from the heart and have nothing to do with the weakness or strength of the parties or the differences between their religious practices. Such friendship is evidenced by joint action and mutual support in all matters except those which in their very nature must call for independent action. While therefore it is highly desirable that Hindus and Mussalmans should follow the directions of their respective religions in matters concerning their religious functions and ceremonial independently of each other, it is essential for the maintenance of Hindu-Muslim unity that they should work together shoulder to shoulder in all secular matters.'

I trust that the above quotations will make my meaning perfectly clear to newspaper readers as indeed it was to the audience addressed by me.

*The next point on which my Lucknow speech has been misreported has been made the subject of a leading article in the Leader. I am supposed to have threatened the Liberals by exposing them in their true colours if they refused to join hands with the Swarajya party. I did nothing of the kind. What I stated was:—*

'I have undertaken my present tour on a mission of peace and will avoid all hostile criticism of any of the other political parties. At the same time I must not be understood to look upon the work of the Liberal party in the Councils as at all satisfactory or commendable. I am here to invite all political parties, Liberals, zemindars and others, to discuss our programme with us in an amicable spirit and to join us if they agree. Personally, I am prepared to

*Leader*<sup>1</sup> and the *Voice of India*<sup>2</sup> have devoted leading articles to some of the statements attributed to me and certain remarks inaccurately reported have elicited adverse criticism in other quarters. I did not speak from notes, but my memory is quite fresh, and the abortive attempts at reporting though wholly unintelligible as they stand, afford sufficient help to enable me to reconstruct the speeches almost verbatim if I only had the time to do so. But my programme is too crowded to permit the time and labour involved in this process. It will serve all practical purposes to give the relevant passage and the context in which they occurred. I shall feel obliged if you will be good enough to allow me an opportunity to remove all misapprehension by publishing this letter.

The most unfortunate of these inaccuracies occurs in the report of my Lucknow speech in the following passage:—

'He declared that after much thought he had come to the conclusion that to make both Hindus and Mussalmans walk in the same path was impossible. The only possible solution in his opinion was to minimise the points of difference and to bring them together wherever possible without the risk of a collision.'

This has provoked a good deal of adverse criticism from the leader writer of the *Voice of India* of Bombay. I give below the full text of the opening part of my Lucknow speech in which the sentences misquoted in the report occur:—

'I propose to address you on two questions of vital importance. The first is Hindu-Muslim unity and the second is the unfortunate difference of opinion which has resulted in the formation of parties within the Congress. Never in the whole course of my life have I felt a situation graver than the one in which we find ourselves today. We see before us the mighty wave of nationalism which swept the country from end to end some 18 months ago, gradually losing itself in the sands of communal animosity and party strife. If this annihilating process is allowed to go on for any length of time a united Indian nation will ever remain a dream without any substance. I do not claim to have discovered some magic or charm to check that devastating process but am here today simply to lay bare my heart to you in the hope of gaining that sympathy and support which I expect from you. There can be no question that all earnest public workers have the single aim of attaining Swarajya as speedily as possible and it is to be deeply regretted that this unity of purpose should be defeated by a diversity of method and detail. I fully realise the difficulty of chalking out a line of uniform action when each party fully believes in its own method. If it were merely a matter of taking different routes to reach the same goal, the problem would naturally solve itself in course of time. But the misfortune is that these routes instead of directly converging upon the common goal, cross and recross at so many points that frequent collisions become unavoidable and the weary travellers ultimately find themselves hopelessly lost in a labyrinth of their own making. As it is futile to

<sup>1</sup>The *Leader* was established at Allahabad in October 1909 principally by Madan Mohan Malaviya. C.Y. Chintamani was its editor, 1909-23, 1926-41.

<sup>2</sup>*Voice of India* was a monthly started from Bombay in 1883.

a newly appointed Minister to overhaul the policy of his predecessor immediately after taking charge of his office and one would expect that a decision having been finally arrived at, the formalities following upon it would be gone through by the secretariat officials concerned without any further reference to the new Minister. It is clear that I hold no brief for the latter, but I cannot help sympathising with him when after being wholly absolved from blame he is ungenerously pricked as he is about to heave a sigh of relief. I leave the matter at that as it is no concern of mine to apportion credit and blame between the rising and fallen stars of the bureaucracy. Whether it is the one or the other or both the contrast between the attitudes of the cooperating Ministers and the non-cooperating municipal commissioners brought out in my reply to the address of the Lucknow municipal board holds equally good.

The history of the Government order and the exposition of the law on the subject given by Pandit Jagat Narain are very interesting, but I fail to see the relevancy of either.

If Pandit Sahib had given a few important dates it would have saved him the trouble of vindicating the benevolent intentions of the Government and its Ministry. The question of the propriety of contributions from municipal funds to memorials to honour the memory of the dead and garden parties to entertain the living members of the civil service was indeed worthy of a serious reference by the commissioners of divisions to local Government and the laudable self-sacrifice of the Ministers in refusing the sanction of any expenditure over addresses to themselves can hardly be doubted. The point, however, is how was it that the question of addresses to political leaders came up before the Government? So far as I am aware, no municipality in these provinces had voted an address to any non-official before the Allahabad municipality decided to honour Mr. C.R. Das. We know that the same municipality, with the identical personnel but at a time when the elections were far off, had rejected a motion for presenting an address to the great leader of political leaders, Mahatma Gandhi. Is Pandit Jagat Narain in a position to say that the Government order in question was passed before and without any reference to the resolution of the Allahabad municipal board about Mr. Das? The dates of three important events, namely (1) the said resolution of the Allahabad board, (2) the recommendations of the standing committee, (3) the decision of the Government or the Ministry on such recommendations would help more to clear up the facts than a cart-load of secretariat files of correspondence between the Government and commissioners of divisions.

As to the law on the subject I see nothing in Section 8(n) having either a direct or indirect reference to addresses and garden parties so as to fix the attention of the legislator upon any of those pleasing functions. But there is no doubt that the clause is an unwarranted interference with the discretion vested in municipal boards by the foregoing clauses of the Section. It may be incidentally remarked that in saying that his opinion was shared by Pandit Motilal Nehru also in 1916 when the Municipalities Bill was on the anvil of Legislation in that year, the Pandit Sahib has evidently lost sight of the fact that clause (n) of Section 8 was for the first time introduced by an amending Act in 1919 when I had ceased to take any interest in Councils. It was no part of the Bill with which I had something to do.

meet them half-way in putting forth our demand and reducing it to a minimum. But once that demand is made there is no going back upon it for us, and if it is refused the only course open to us is to give battle to the Government and refuse all cooperation unless and until that demand is fully considered. We are not in love with memorials and deputations. Clear, open, downright opposition is our only weapon. If however our friends of the other parties do not agree with us in this method, we shall be driven to oppose them with all our strength at the coming election and then

کھینچی گئے دفتر ادر ہمارے ادر ہمارے

The so-called threat has been inferred from the well-known line of the poet which can only mean that if it comes to a contest at the elections one party will be free to criticise the other.

The next inaccuracy I have to notice is contained in the reported summary of my Lahore speech in which I am made to say:—

'Personally he was willing to abide by the mandate of the Congress even if it be against his views, provided the mandate represented the real and well-considered views of the nation.'

I have given no such undertaking. What I said was that if the Congress gave a mandate against Council entry by such an overwhelming majority as might reasonably be taken to represent the real and well considered opinion of the country, there would in my opinion be no justification for the supporters of Council entry to work within the Congress and it would be a question for the Swarajya party to consider whether they would attain any measure of success by working independently of the Congress. I then pointed out that the result of such a mandate would be to drive out of the Congressmen as much devoted to the common cause as any other class of non-cooperators can claim to be. This I said would be a misfortune at a time when the country sorely needed the services of all.

Motilal Nehru

### 13. To the Editor<sup>1</sup>

Sir—Pandit Jagat Narain has done a public service in giving the history of the Government order concerning the presentation of addresses by local bodies. I am sorry his original communication as published in the *Hamdam*<sup>2</sup> of Lucknow is not available to me, but I take it that the version wired by your Lucknow correspondent and published in *The Leader* of the 24th instant is a faithful translation of the valuable contribution made by the Pandit Sahib to the vernacular press. While admitting full responsibility for the offending order, he has slightly deviated from his usual fairness by taking his successor to task for carrying out the policy laid down by himself. It can hardly be the duty of

<sup>1</sup>The *Leader*, 31 August 1923.

<sup>2</sup>*Hamdam* was a well known Urdu weekly established by Mau'ana Abdul Bari at Lucknow in 1912.

the liberty of thousands of their countrymen. Pandit Jagat Narain has informed me that he does not intend to stand at the forthcoming election, but we know that his learned colleague is carrying on a vigorous electioneering campaign in the Benares and Gorakhpur divisions. Will this gentleman have the fairness and courage to inform his electorate that he was in favour of orders issued against the non-cooperators 'who deliberately challenged the Government to do its worst and who signed the pledge to civilly disobey the notifications under the Criminal Law Amendment Act, etc.'? But whether he does so or not, public memory is not so short as it is supposed to be. So far as I am concerned I deliberately challenge the Government now, as I have done in the past, to do its worst and without signing any pledge and without any resolution of the Provincial Congress Committee or any other authority, declare my fixed determination to civilly disobey all laws and orders which curtail my liberty as a free citizen when obedience of such laws and orders on my part would involve either national or personal dishonour.

Before I close let me assure Pandit Jagat Narain, if he needs such assurance from me, that I attribute no motives to him. He ought to be only too well aware of my personal regard for him to entertain any such suspicion. Where he fails to come upto my expectation is well known to him and need not be mentioned here.

Camp: Gorakhpore, Agra.

Motilal Nehru

#### 14. To Manohar Nath Sapru<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan  
Allahabad  
7.9.23

Dear Manohar Nathji<sup>2</sup>,

As I told you when you were here the Bareilly National School is on its last legs and that I had taken the liberty to promise a donation of Rs 100/- per month to be paid by Beti Saheba<sup>3</sup>.

I have just received a letter saying that immediate help is necessary. I hope you have obtained the sanction of Beti Saheba and communicated her orders to the Bareilly Manager.

The School is held in the compound of Pandit Dwarka Prasad, Senior Vice-Chairman Municipal Board Bareilly who has generously erected a number of

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Manohar Nath Sapru, succeeded Pandit Jagat Mohan Nath Raina as Manager of Lakshna estate and continued to hold that post till 1928.

<sup>3</sup>Beti Maha Lakshmi Bai, b. 1868 at Lakshna, Etawah district, U.P.; daughter of Rani Kshetri; married to Kunwar Ganpat Gopal Mura of Bareilly in 1882; inherited the zamindari of Bareilly from her husband and the districts of Etawah and Mainpuri from her mother; received the title of Rani from Viceroy Lord Reading in 1924; d. 1957.



I now come to the crux of the matter which Pandit Sahib has touched but lightly and passed over with a forced attempt to ridicule the programme of Mr. C.R. Das which did not come into existence till long after Pandit Sahib had donned the robes of office. In my reply to the address of the Lucknow municipality I charged the Ministers with having been parties to the application of those disgraceful pieces of repressive legislation called the Criminal Law Amendment Act<sup>1</sup> and Prevention of Seditious Meetings Act<sup>2</sup> to these provinces. I did so on the strength of a statement of Sir Harcourt Butler made about the time in which he affirmed that the said Acts were applied with the full concurrence of the Ministers. If I am not mistaken the Government order applying at least one of these Acts specifically mentioned the fact that in passing that order the Government was acting with its Ministers. Pandit Jagat Narain evades his own and his colleague's share of responsibility for deliberately depriving their countrymen of the right of free association with the single object of suppressing the great *hartal* organised by the united will of the nation on the occasion of the visit of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales<sup>3</sup> to this country. Pandit Sahib says that he did not think it 'his duty to resign at a decision unconnected with the policy of Ministers' departments'. May I ask if it was the duty of the Ministers to help the Government in coming to a decision cutting at the very root of the most elementary right of citizenship though such decision was 'unconnected with the policy of the Ministers' departments'? I can understand the position taken up by *The Leader* in the editorial note appearing in its issue of the 19th instant wherein it is said referring to myself: 'He ought to be the last man to complain against the camel loads of orders issued against the non-cooperators as he was one of those who deliberately challenged the Government to do its worst and who signed the pledge to civilly disobey the notifications issued under the Criminal Law Amendment Act and all such laws and Government orders as might be determined upon from time to time by the Provincial Congress Committee.' But I cannot understand the Ministers concerned when after going out of their way to suppress the liberty of the subjects they seek shelter under cover of diarchy and protect their innocence on the ground that the matter was 'unconnected with the policy of the Ministers' departments.' Who can tell that the Government notification would have been issued even if the Ministers when actually consulted had, raised their voice against it and made a bold stand to protect public rights? But the principle of joint responsibility over trifles was dearer to them than

<sup>1</sup>Criminal Law Amendment Act was passed in December 1908 to expedite the trials of cases against persons involved in terrorist crimes and anarchist conspiracies and to end the existence of certain volunteer organisations by declaring them unlawful.

<sup>2</sup>Prevention of Seditious Meetings Act of 1907, a strongly repressive measure for prevention of public meetings likely to promote sedition and to cause disturbance of public tranquility was replaced by the Prevention of Seditious Meetings Act 1911, with less stringent provisions and on a permanent basis. The Act was later repealed on the recommendation of the Repressive Laws Committee, 1921.

<sup>3</sup>The Prince of Wales; b 1884; Prince of Wales from 1911 and King of Great Britain and Ireland from 20 January to 10 December 1936; abdicated, 11 December 1936; created Duke of Windsor, 12 December 1936; Governor of the Bahamas during the Second World War; d. 1972.

17. To Secretary, Home Department<sup>1</sup>

To  
The Secretary to the Government of India.  
Home Department (Political),  
Simla.

Dated Anand Bhawan, Allahabad 18th Oct. 1923

Sir,

I have the honour to state that the Swarajya Party is advised that the disqualification imposed by Rule 5 subrule (2) of the Rules for the election of members to the Legislative Assembly and the Provincial Legislative Councils is not applicable to members of the Party who have been ordered to furnish security under Sec. 108 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and have elected to go to prison instead of giving the security required. The average voter is not sufficiently instructed in law to differentiate between imprisonment on conviction and detention in prison for default in furnishing security and the numerous enquiries made from the Provinces where proceedings under the section were resorted to against non-cooperators on an extensive scale show that considerable doubt exists on the point in the public mind. I shall feel obliged by your letting me know if in these circumstances the Government of India considers it desirable to issue any instructions on the subject or take such other steps as it may deem fit. A copy of Counsel's opinion is hereto attached.

I have the honour to be,  
Sir,  
Yours etc.  
(Motilal Nehru)  
General Secretary

## OPINION

Rule 5, subrule (2) contemplates three things:

- (i) An offence actually committed.
- (ii) A conviction for that offence.
- (iii) A sentence of imprisonment for more than 6 months involved in such conviction.

These three elements should be found in a given case before the Rule can be applied. They are all absent in proceedings under Sec. 108 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and the Rule is wholly inapplicable. The reasons for this opinion are:—

(i) Sec. 108 occurs in Part IV of the Code which deals with "prevention of offences". The object is to prevent the future commission of the offences referred to in the Section and if any such offence has actually been committed to

buildings for holding classes and lodgings of the teachers. All payments for the school should be made through him

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

Syt. Manohar Nath  
Manager "Lakhna Estate"  
P.O. Lakhna  
District Etawah

### 15. Telegram for Nabha Visit<sup>1</sup>

Allahabad, Sept. 23

Starting today by Punjab mail for Nabha to interview my son Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru reported to have been arrested under section 188 and now in State custody. I have so far taken no part in Akali agitation and sole object of present visit is to see my son. I expect there will be no interference or molestation by the subordinate officials in the exercise of my natural rights.

### 16. To Kapildeva Malaviya<sup>2</sup>

Post Fatehpore.  
1.10.23

My dear Kapil,

I am about to enter Allahabad in decidedly better spirits than those in which I left Ambala. The short visit to Delhi has had much to do with the change. I found Kamla & Indu in very good health in spite of the hysterical fits and dengue which the former had gone through. The quiescent & cheering presence of Hakim Sahib with his unbreakable attachment to me & mine soon made me take a brighter view of life. I do not know what is going to happen when I get back to Allahabad but of one thing I can assure you that you will not be ashamed of whatever decision I finally make.

I do not know if this letter will ever reach you & will not spend more time & energy on it. You can judge from the handwriting how troublesome it is to write in the rickety compartment I am travelling in.

I shall expect your telegram tonight.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

<sup>1</sup>The Leader, 24 September 1923. The telegram was sent by Pandit Motilal Nehru to the Viceroy, the Governor of the Punjab, the Administrator of Nabha, the Chief Magistrate of Nabha and the Superintendent of Nabha Police.

<sup>2</sup>Motilal Nehru Papers

20. To Krishnakant Malaviya<sup>1</sup>

20.10.1923

Dear Krishnakant,

Can you supply me with a thousand prints of the Hindi translation of the Swarajya Party election manifesto as it has appeared or will appear in the *Abhyudaya* which is very easy to separate the matter from the remaining contents of the paper and strike off a few thousand copies on cheap paper to be distributed broadcast ? On your letting me know that you can do this and what it will cost I shall give final instructions. Please see me this evening.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

Syt. Pandit Krishnakant Malaviya,  
The *Abhyudaya* Press,  
Johnstongung,  
Allahabad.

21. To Secretary, Home Department<sup>2</sup>

To  
The Secretary to the Government of India,  
Home Department (Political),  
Simla.

Dated Anand Bhawan, Allahabad the 22nd Oct. 1923

Sir,

I have the honour to bring the following facts to the notice of the Government of India:—

I was convicted under Section 17B CrI. A. Act read with 117 I.P.C. on the 3rd Jan. 1922 and a sentence of 18 months was passed. This sentence was on . . . . . reduced to 6 months by the Government and after having served the reduced sentence I was released on 1st July 1922.

Being desirous of standing as a candidate for election to the Legislative Assembly from one of the constituencies of the United Provinces I have taken legal advice as to the applicability to me of Rule 5 subrule (2) of the Rules for the election and nomination of members to the Legislative Assembly. I have been advised that the said subrule does not apply to me. A copy of Counsel's opinion is herewith enclosed.

The language of the Rule not being so clear as the intention with which it was framed I beg to bring these facts to the notice of the Govt. with a view to

<sup>1</sup> AICC Papers.<sup>2</sup> AICC Papers.

prevent the person proceeded against from repeating it and not to punish him for what he has already done.

(ii) A proceeding under the Section is not a trial but an "inquiry", in the course of which "no charge need be framed" though it is to be made "as nearly as practicable" in the manner prescribed for warrant cases (Sec. 117). There can be no conviction in a warrant case without a regular trial on a proper charge.

(iii) What has to be proved at such inquiry is not that an offence has been committed but that "it is necessary that the person in respect of whom the inquiry is made should execute a bond" (Sec. 118). If such necessity is established all that a magistrate can do is to make an order calling upon the person proceeded against to furnish security to be of good behaviour for a certain period. There is no power to convict.

(iv) If the order to furnish such security is not obeyed no "sentence" of imprisonment for any definite term is passed but the person concerned is only committed to prison and "detained" there until the security required is given or the period for which it is required expires (Sec. 128). This detention is not imprisonment and may last for a day or a year just as it suits the person proceeded against.

#### 18. Telegram to the Editor, *Amrita Bazar Patrika*<sup>1</sup>

Editor

*Amrita Bazar Patrika*<sup>2</sup>

Calcutta.

Punjab news being suppressed send your special representative immediately.

Nehru

Anand Bhawan, Allahabad 19.10.23

#### 19. Telegram to A.T. Gidwani<sup>3</sup>

Gidwani

Vidyapith

Ahmedabad

Your help badly wanted in Amritsar start when well enough Jawahar suffering from remittent fever last twelve days cant leave him.

Nehru

Allahabad. 20.10.23

<sup>1</sup>*AICC Papers.*

<sup>2</sup>The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* was started as a Bengali weekly in March 1868 by Sisir Kumar Ghose and his brothers from the village of Amrita Bazar in Jessore district. It started publishing columns in English in 1869 and in 1871 was moved to Calcutta. The issue following the passage of the Vernacular Press Act, 1878, appeared wholly in English. It became a daily in 1891.

<sup>3</sup>*AICC Papers.*

rajya Party of the Indian National Congress for the information of the British Cabinet.

I have the honour to be,  
Sir,  
Your obedient servant,  
(Motilal Nehru)  
General Secretary

24. To S.V. Kowjalgi<sup>1</sup>

6th Nov. 1923

Dear Sir,

Your letter of the 1st instant. I regret my inability to attend the 2nd Karnatak Provincial Conference owing to the great distance. Besides I shall have to travel while the Swarajya Party election campaign is proceeding.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)  
General Secretary

Syt. S.V. Kowjalgi<sup>1</sup>,  
Chairman R.C.,  
Bijapur

25. To Jawahar<sup>2</sup>

Bareilly  
16.11.23

My dear Jawahar,

In less than half an hour after the train started from the Amritsar station I was in the grip of a violent attack of shivering followed by the usual temperature which however did not go beyond 103. When I got down here I was free from fever and have taken all the orthodox steps to prevent a return of the attack. I am resting here for the day and after making a short speech at this evening's meeting will leave for Lucknow by the night train. So far I have no intention of modifying my programme in any way.

obtain an authoritative expression of the true intention of the rule and request the favour of your putting up the case for the consideration of the Govt. and let me know the orders passed thereon.

I have the honour to be,  
Sir,  
Your obedient servant,  
(Motilal Nehru)

22. *To Bipin Chandra Pal*<sup>1</sup>

24.10.1923

Dear Mr. Pal,

I am in receipt of your letter of 17th. Please pardon the delay in acknowledging it due to Jawaharlal's continued illness. I am glad to say he is now very much better.

I feel flattered by your asking me to influence Mr. Das in the interest of the cause to get Mr. Chandra to retire in your favour but I feel that your towering abilities are not unknown to Mr. Das while Mr. Chandra is practically unknown to me. Our practice is to accept candidates recommended unanimously by a Provincial Council without question and it is hardly open to me to take any exception to the choice of the President himself.

Hoping you are in good health.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

Syt. Bipin Chandra Pal,  
P. 53C Russa Road South,  
Bhawanipur,  
Calcutta.

23. *To Secretary of State for India*<sup>2</sup>

To  
The Right Hon'ble the Secretary of State for India in Council  
Whitehall London, W.

Anand Bhawan Allahabad, 24th Oct. 1923

Sir,  
I have the honour to send 25 copies of the Election Manifesto of the Swa-

<sup>1</sup>AIIC Papers.

<sup>2</sup>AIIC Papers.

Evidently 'Recluse' in his seclusion is wholly ignorant of what is happening. The Swaraj Party has put forward Syt. Ram Chandra Sinha<sup>1</sup> from Lucknow district against all others whether they represent the Liberal Party or the zamindars or merely themselves. I have asked voters to vote for him and for no one else. Pandit Gokaran Nath Misra being the sitting member and laying claim to great services performed by his party was naturally referred to by me at greater length than the other candidates. But I referred to the other candidates also at some length on, among others, the precise grounds referred to by 'Recluse'. As regards the candidate who is an honorary magistrate and honorary assistant collector, I gave the general advice that no person who had received or was expecting to receive any favours from the Government was deserving of public support and while speaking against the attempts to attract voters on communal lines, I mentioned the case of the candidate who comes from the same class of Brahmins as I do and whom I opposed as strongly as the other two rivals of the Swarajist candidate. All this has been omitted from the *Indian Daily Telegraph* report. As for the merits of Syt. Ram Chandra any one who knows him knows well about his ability and competence. Comparisons are odious and I do not wish to make them.

I need not enter into the large question of policy raised by 'Recluse.' Enough has been said about it already and every one knows how and why the Swaraj Party was formed and also that Mr. Rajagopalachari and I differ on some important points. 'Recluse' need not worry about the prestige of the Congress or about the doctrine of Ahimsa or non-violence being given up. It is strange how the Congress and non-cooperation have suddenly begun to appeal to gentlemen who were not enamoured of either not many months ago.

I am surprised at the charge of want of chivalry and 'aiming arrows against a sick lion'. I am not aware of any moral or political rule of conduct which lays down that a person with whom you do not agree should not be opposed at an election if he happens to be ill. Some of us had imagined that political prisoners in jail would be spared personal attacks from outside but the walls of Yerwada have not proved a sufficient protection even for Mahatma Gandhi.

Lastly, I am charged with supporting the candidature of an 'undesirable individual' with whom I refused to associate myself on a former occasion. I am not aware of having done so.

Your correspondent has made many insinuations calling them facts 'the truth of which, he says, I cannot possibly deny,' but which none the less I do deny. He has asked melodramatically if I am fair to the Mahatma or to the Congress or to the electorate or lastly even to the Liberals. He has demanded of me a higher standard of political morality. I am obliged to him for these

<sup>1</sup>Ram Chandra Sinha, b. 1897, educated at Lucknow; worked with Prof. C.V. Raman; joined the non-cooperation movement, 1920, arrested, December 1920; member, U.P. Legislative Council, 1923-26; General Secretary, U.P.P.C.C., 1924; went back to scientific research and took M.Sc. degree in Physics; worked with Einstein and Prof. Freundlich in Germany on the General Theory of Relativity; passed LL.B. examination in 1935, took sabbatical in 1961; known as Swami Ram Ashram; established 'Vijnanika Jivana Ashrama', Lucknow.



I have read Taraknath Das's<sup>1</sup> letter. I think Lalaji ought to see it and am enclosing<sup>2</sup> it for that purpose. You can of course show it to any others you like. I hope you have secured due publicity of the enclosures in that letter which I have not seen. *Independent* is no good. *Bombay Chronicle*<sup>3</sup> will be the best—unless you can have copies made and supplied to other papers.

Your loving  
Father

#### 26. To the Editor<sup>4</sup>

I returned to Allahabad yesterday after a lengthy tour during which I was continually on the move and could not read any newspapers. On arrival my attention was drawn to 'An open letter', addressed to me by 'Recluse', appearing in your issue dated the 3rd December.

The quotation consisting of disjointed sentences, with which the letter begins, is incorrect and misleading and does not represent what I said at the Allahabad meeting or any other meeting. The report of my speech as it appeared in the *Indian Daily Telegraph*<sup>5</sup> was shown to me by a friend while I was motoring at top speed to address a series of election meetings arranged on the roadside. A cursory glance at it satisfied me that it was inaccurate in many particulars, but I could not find time to send the necessary corrections to the press while I was on my tour. No notes of the speech were taken on the spot and it was apparently reproduced by the correspondent of the *Indian Daily Telegraph* from memory, hence a misleading report. 'Recluse' is very much mistaken if he imagines that this paper is the trumpeter of the Swaraj Party.

I have taken pains at every meeting that I have addressed to make the position of the Swaraj Party in relation to the Congress quite clear. I have on no occasion made any such foolish statement that people should place confidence in Mr. Das or me because we were Mahatma Gandhi's trusted colleagues or because Mahatmaji trusted us. I have said at my meetings that Mahatmaji being in jail we could not have any clear guidance from him and that so far as I know he had refused to send any definite message to us outside. He felt that a person in jail should not interfere with outside affairs as he is not in a position to know all the facts. I would refer 'Recluse' to my Benares speech reported in the *Independent* of the 7th December if he wants to understand the position I have taken all along during my election campaign.

<sup>1</sup>Taraknath Das; b. 1884; revolutionary exile in America; a follower of Swami Vivekananda; member, Anushilan party, gave up his studies to participate in the anti-partition agitation, 1905 but had to flee the country; went to U.S.A.; started *Free Hindustan*; established India Independence League in California; later became Professor of Political Science at Columbia University and also a Fellow of the University of Washington; Founder, Vivekananda Society in Calcutta; d. 1958.

<sup>2</sup>See Appendix III, I.

<sup>3</sup>The *Bombay Chronicle* was founded by Pherozshah Mehta and others in 1913 with B.G. Horniman as editor.

<sup>4</sup>The *Leader*, 10 December 1923.

<sup>5</sup>The *Indian Daily Telegraph* was launched from Lucknow. It was purchased from Rai Bahadur Bishen Narayan Bhargava by the Maharaja of Nabha in 1926.

deciding upon a policy of joint action. I hope both the meetings will be largely attended.

Motilal Nehru  
General Secretary,  
All India Swarajya Party

Anand Bhawan  
Allahabad.

#### AGENDA OF BUSINESS

1. To settle general principles and policy to be followed by the Swarajist members of the Indian and Provincial Legislatures.
2. To formulate specific demands on behalf of India to be presented to the British Government.
3. To frame such instructions for the guidance of the members of the said legislatures as may be deemed necessary.
4. To appoint a small committee to deal with all the questions which may arise from time to time out of the proceedings in the said legislatures and also all questions affecting the conduct of the Swarajist members and their relation to other parties and members of the said legislatures.

29. To Rana<sup>1</sup>

1.1.1924

My dear Mr. Rana,

I am sorry I could not write to you earlier. The Editor of the *Bombay Chronicle* has not written to me about you. As regards the *Forward*<sup>2</sup> I understand that Mr. Thulsi<sup>3</sup> is acting as its U.P. correspondent. As he was recommended by me before his appointment you will appreciate my inability to request the Editor to replace him which I would be virtually doing if I recommend you. I trust you will excuse me.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

suggestions and gentle hints. May I remind him that it is not customary to make serious charges affecting a person's honour under cover of anonymity? This is usually considered unfair. I shall be glad if 'Recluse' will disclose his identity and will also tell us in what way he has served the Congress or non-violent, non-cooperation which he seeks to defend so fervently from the assaults of Swarajists.

As 'Recluse' is rightly desirous of raising the standard of political morality, I would draw his attention to the convenient use some non-Swarajist candidates are making of religion and how deliberate attempts are made to create communal bitterness. I would specially draw 'Recluse' attention to the device of the very ingenious candidate who has appealed for votes on the ground that he is the disciple of Mahatma Gandhi's political *Guru* Mr. Gokhale. The notice on which this appeal is printed has the Mahatma's name printed in large capitals on top. I wonder what the other disciples of Mahatma Gandhi's political *Guru* think of this. Did he or they remember the relation or help their *Guru-bhai* in spreading non-cooperation? What did he or they do when their *Guru's* other disciple, who is called Mahatma Gandhi, was sent to jail?

Motilal Nehru

Anand Bhawan December 7.

### 27. Telegram to M.R. Jayakar<sup>1</sup>

19 Dec. 1923

Jayakar  
Thakurdwar Bombay

Calling meeting General Council Swarajya Party Cocanada twenty-sixth to settle Assembly and Council policy another meeting of all elected members Assembly and Councils Allahabad fifth January to settle joint action earnestly request you attend both meetings.

Nehru

### 28. The Swaraj Party Circular<sup>2</sup>

A meeting of the General Council of the All India Swarajya Party will be held at Cocanada on the 29th December to settle the policy of the party with regard to the work in the Assembly and the Councils.

A meeting of all the elected members of the Assembly and the Provincial Councils will be held at Allahabad on the 5th January for the purpose of

<sup>1</sup>M.R. Jayakar Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Forward, 23 December 1923. Motilal Nehru, General Secretary of the All India Swarajya Party issued this circular.

32. To M.R. Jayakar<sup>1</sup>

23.1.24

My dear Jayakar,

I have received your letter of the 15th forwarded here from Nagpur, and carefully read the copy of the rules enclosed in it. I thank you for the courtesy of sending the rules framed by your Committee to the Central office and the trouble you have taken to explain the circumstances under which they were passed. The Central Executive Committee will meet in Delhi on the 3rd February and I am glad you will be there as a co-opted member to put the Bombay view before the meeting.

I think however it is but fair to tell you that personally I object to any Provincial Committee going directly against the rules framed by the General Council even for the best of reasons in the world. In the present case I see no justification for Bombay Swarajists summarily setting aside the instructions issued at Cocanada without any reference to the Central Committee. There was ample time to discuss the matter by correspondence if not verbally at a regular meeting. But the Bombay Committee has taken it upon itself to ride roughshod through the resolutions of the General Committee and rush into [print to proclaim] the feat it has performed. Clause 4(b) and (c) of your [letter to] which you draw my particular attention are the most amazing [part of] the whole production. They not only draw attention of the General Council to its crass stupidity in ignoring the special circumstances of the Province even after hearing such an able exponent of Bombay views as yourself but by the publication authorised by Clause (c) advertise to the world how silly the General Council has been. I have not seen the actual newspaper report but I take it that the leader and the Deputy leader have faithfully carried out the instructions of the Swarajya Party of Bombay.

If there is one thing more than another with which the Swarajya Party has impressed the Congress, the officials and the public alike it is the exemplary discipline which its members displayed till very recently. Madras with its 7 Swarajists was the first to fall out of line and was quickly followed by the Punjab with a total strength of 8 Swarajists in the Council. It is now the turn of Bombay. What will come next? Perhaps a general disintegration of the Party on the ground that each individual member is governed by the "special circumstances" of his own environments.

But what are these "special circumstances" that one is invariably confronted with in every Province. I confess I have never been able to understand them. Either a particular Province is ready to adopt the Swarajist programme or it is not. If it is not I see no reason why it should profess to do so when it means exactly the opposite. "[Special] circumstances" undoubtedly govern every Province in [matters like these] but if they are allowed to whittle away the characteristic features of the programme the only honest course for us to follow is to give it up in its entirety and publicly admit that it was wholly misconceived. You very rightly apprehend that the Bombay rules might be taken to be a "slight departure from the usually expected attitude of Non-

30. To Jawaharlal Rohatgi<sup>1</sup>

19.1.1924

Dear Jawaharlal.

I enclose<sup>2</sup> copy of a telegram I sent yesterday to Kamlapat<sup>3</sup> and his reply received this morning. Remarkable as the success of Narain Prasad Arora<sup>4</sup> has been I am afraid the price paid for it was much too high. I do hope that Kamlapat's contribution has not been absorbed by the aftermath of the Cawnpore election. I have now no fund public or private at my disposal to draw upon to meet the heavy liabilities incurred during the elections. I am going to Lucknow tonight for a day to see if any coalition with other parties is possible and hope you will send Kamlapat's money as well as any other that may have come to hand so as to be available to me on my return. I have sent a similar telegram to Tejpal Jamnadas,<sup>5</sup> Mirzapur but have received no reply.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

Syt. Dr. Jawaharlal,  
Civil Lines,  
Cawnpore

31. Telegram to Devadas Gandhi<sup>6</sup>

Allahabad 22.1.24

Devadas Gandhi Sassoon Hospital  
Poona

Wire if I can see Mahatmaji twentyfifth morning.

Nehru

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers.

<sup>2</sup>See Appendix III, 2.

<sup>3</sup>Kamlapat Singhania; b. 1884, father of Lala Padampat Singhania; started a number of commercial and industrial enterprises, Governing Director, Juggilal Kamlapat Group of Mills, Kanpur; first President, Merchants' Chamber of U.P.; headed the historic procession to observe 'Boycott Week' on behalf of the business community, 18 August 1930, d. 1937.

<sup>4</sup>Narayan Prasad Arora, b. 1881; member, Kanpur Congress Committee; participated in the non-cooperation, civil disobedience and Quit India movements; member, U.P. Legislative Council, 1923-26, d. 1961.

<sup>5</sup>Telegram was addressed to Seth Rameshwar Das Bajaj, Proprietor of the commercial firm, Tejpal Jamnadas of Mirzapur, founded by his father Lala Jamnadas Bajaj. Seth Rameshwar Das Bajaj, b. 1890 at Bisau, Churu, Rajasthan; educated at Bisau and Mirzapur; social reformer, philanthropist, educationist and a staunch supporter of Indian National Congress, Sarpanch of Mirzapur; was also known as Nagar Seth, d. 1937.

<sup>6</sup>Gandhi Papers

itself. Experience has shown that I was right though the hopes I entertained have in a great measure been frustrated by the senseless opposition of the no-changers. But my faith in our original programme remains undiminished and I believe we can still do much if we only hold together and always remember that we have gone into the Councils to use them for our own purpose and not to be used by the Councils to carry on the present system with a few advantages here and there. The C.P. have shown what we could do in every Council if the Gaya Congress had only accepted the recommendations of the Civil Disobedience Enquiry Committee or even any of the amendments proposed. That was however not to be and the no-changers have now put us in a position in which the slightest departure from our professions would make us a laughing stock of the whole country.

Please be rest assured that what I have said above is more in sorrow than in anger. I have freely disburdened my mind to you. This letter is not meant as an official communication from the General Secretary to the Bombay Swarajists though you can of course make such confidential use of it as you like. I have always had the highest regard for your opinions and I do not think you will be able to recall a single instance where I have not sought your advice when the occasion demanded it. I have said whatever came uppermost in my mind with the sole object of giving you a clear indication of my personal attitude in the matter. It will of course be for the Committee which meets at Delhi to deal with the matter formally in any manner it decides upon. For my own part I can only say that I am very sore at heart by the exhibitions of impatience at wholesome restraints that I see around me.

The latest news from Poona is that I shall be allowed to see Mahatma Gandhi. Much as I wish to do so I feel I have to stick to my post of duty here. There are numerous details which require looking after before I leave for Delhi. But it is quite possible that I may suddenly make up my mind to pay a flying visit to the Sassoon Hospital at Poona and from there proceed direct to Delhi. In either case I expect to reach Delhi on the 29th or the 30th. I have taken quarters in the Western Hostel, Raisina.

Hoping to meet you at Delhi.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

### 33. To Party Leaders<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
24.1.24

Dear Sir,

As you are probably aware the Swarajya Party has laid before the country a proposal formulating the National Demand to be presented on behalf of

cooperation in Councils". It is easily conceivable that a number of such slight departures in various Provinces put together would end in our entirely breaking away from our moorings and drifting aimlessly on the currents generated by our independent friends. It is clear to me that the so-called "special circumstances" only mean the special concessions of principle which our "Independent" friends demand as a price of their support. Our minorities in their eagerness to show their fighting qualities do not stop to consider whether the price demanded is reasonable. The one thing they hate is "sitting with folded hands" forgetting that that attitude is not always a sign of weakness. I have myself been a wrestler in the good old days and had some practice in the art of "catch as catch can" (which as you know is the system universally followed in Indian wrestling). But there are certain things strictly prohibited even in that system. As to the "few stalwart members of our Party who attach great weight to the wishes and requirements of their electorates" may I in all humility enquire if it was not their duty when seeking election on the Swarajya ticket to make it perfectly clear to the electorates what that meant. We in the U.P. have met with no difficulty in doing so.

It seems to me that in the very nature of things the only right course for us was to abstain from attending the Councils altogether until a definite answer was given by the Government to our demands. This was the course followed by the Sinn Feiners<sup>1</sup> in the British Parliament who were in a small minority. Swarajists even when in such minorities as we are in the Punjab and Madras could in my opinion do more to help the general cause by marking time for a few months than they can possibly do by the finest display of oratory in the Council Chamber. New developments are bound to take place in the near future and will in no small measure be affected by the general attitude of the Party members in the Councils. If they show a bold front everywhere adhering strictly to their programme irrespective of their numbers the Party as a whole will stand before the world as a body of determined men who cannot be trifled with. But if on the contrary compromises with principles lead different Provinces in different directions showing an utter want of cohesion the Party as a whole will stand condemned before the world in spite of such successes as it may possibly achieve here and there. Standing by themselves minorities cannot do much good in the Councils, but by compromising their principles they can do incalculable harm to the general movement.

It is hardly necessary for me to tell you that I am a Non-cooperator first and a Swarajist afterwards. The one reason which induced me to take a prominent part in starting the Swarajya Party was the conviction that real Non-cooperation had practically ceased to exist and that the general elections which were then about to take place afforded a splendid opportunity for reviving it in a new form which would capture the imagination of the country. I believed that by entering into the Councils we would be able not merely to show what real Non-cooperation is but would give a general impetus to the whole movement. Indeed I fondly hoped that it would be possible to lay the foundations of a genuine Civil Disobedience campaign inside the Legislature

<sup>1</sup>Sinn Fein (Ourselves Alone) was a party formed in 1900 by Arthur Griffith which demanded that the Irish members cease to attend the British Parliament and form a National Council in Ireland.

34. *Telegram to Ben Spoor & Colonel Wedgwood*<sup>1</sup>

(1) Ben Spoor Esq. M.P.  
 (2) Colonel Wedgwood M.P.  
 House of Commons  
 London

My resolution asking for Round Table Conference represents result of my best endeavour to unite all shades of Indian nationalist opinion on minimum demand. We are offering you frankly this opportunity of meeting national demand of India presented in most acceptable form. Hope England will not disappoint us and will save India from bitter discontent and misunderstanding.

Motilal Nehru  
 22-2-1924

35. *Telegram to Colonel Wedgwood*<sup>2</sup>

Col Wedgwood  
 House of Commons London

Thanks acting on your advice have stopped refusing further supplies but statement in Parliament adhering ten years programme most discouraging Party pressing rejection Finance Bill on Monday Please read my speech cabled *Herald and Leader*.

Nehru  
 12.3.24

36. *Telegram to Mahatma Gandhi*<sup>3</sup>

Mahatma Gandhi  
 Anandhi Juhu

Delhi  
 18.3.24

Finance Bill again introduced today with Viceroy's recommendation assembly refused leave without division.

Nehru



India to the British Government. A meeting of the elected members of all the Legislatures in India will be held in the Committee room of the Assembly Chamber on Sunday the 3rd February 1924 at 2 p.m. to consider and finally adopt the said Demand. You are cordially invited to attend and take part in the proceedings of the meeting.

I enclose a printed form of a letter addressed to me in which the Draft National Demand as provisionally settled at Lucknow is reproduced. The idea is that this Demand should go from the elected members of all the Legislatures in the country in such form and manner as may be determined upon at the Delhi meeting. I need hardly point out that the adoption of this Demand by gentlemen not belonging to the Swarajya Party will in no way identify them with the programme or the policy of the Party. The Demand is intended to proceed from the whole of Nationalist India embracing all shades of political opinion as represented by the elected members of the Legislatures. After it is presented each party will of course be free to take such action thereon as it may be advised either singly or jointly with other parties. The discussion on the Demand will therefore be confined to the merits without reference to any particular policy or programme.

Should you find it convenient to note your suggestions on the accompanying form or otherwise I shall feel obliged if you will kindly send them to me to enable me to tabulate them with other suggestions which may be received.

Hoping you will make it convenient to attend the meeting.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

1. The Hon. Nawab Abdul Majid.<sup>1</sup>
2. The " Lala Sukhbir Singh.
3. " " Sir Manakji Byramji Dada Bhoy<sup>2</sup>.
4. " " Raja Motichand.
5. " " Maharaja Bahadur Keshoprasad Singh.<sup>3</sup>
6. " " Sir Rameshwar Singh.

<sup>1</sup>Nawab Abdul Majid, b. 1859; zamindar from East U.P.; advocate, Allahabad High Court; attended the inaugural session of the All India Muslim League, Dacca, 1906; President, U.P. Muslim League, 1909, Vice-President, All India Muslim League, 1910; member, U.P. Legislative Council, 1909-10, 1916-19, Imperial Legislative Council, 1910-12, Council of state, 1920-24; d. 1924.

<sup>2</sup>Sir Maneckji Byramji Dadabhoy; b. 1865, member, Bombay Municipal Corporation 1880-90; Government Pleader, Central Provinces, 1891; member, Viceroy's Legislative Council, 1908-12 and 1914-17; Governor, Imperial Bank, 1920-28; member, Council of State, 1921-25, Royal Commission on Indian Currency and Finance; author of *Commentary on the Land Laws of Central Provinces*, *Commentary on the Central Provinces Tenancy Act*; d. 1953.

<sup>3</sup>Maharaja Bahadur Keshav Prasad Singh of Dunwau; b. 1879; ascended gaddi in 1911; title of Maharaja Bahadur conferred in 1914; member, Council of State, 1921-25, Bihar Executive Council, 1926-28; Knighted in 1930 with the title of C.B.E.; d. 1933.

to honour me. I take you will forgive and I thank you sincerely for your kindness. Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar was good enough to stop issue of invitation cards at my request and I trust no inconvenience will be caused by my sudden departure. I take this opportunity to thank all the members of the Nationalist Party for their support and invariable courtesy.

Looking forward to the pleasure of meeting you again during the Simla Session.

(Motilal Nehru)

40. *To Mahatma Gandhi*<sup>1</sup>

Dear Mahatmaji,

Thanks. Mr. Das is here and we have both read the statement. It is now time for me to leave Juhu. Mr. Das will see you tomorrow afternoon at about 4 and will have a talk with you. Good bye till we meet.

Yours sincerely  
Motilal Nehru  
24.5.24

41. *To the Joint Secretary (Home) Government of India*<sup>2</sup>

Sir,

I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 29th May enclosing a copy of a press communique dated the 23rd May relating to the appointment of a committee to enquire into the working of the present constitution and inviting me to become a member. In reply I am to say that I have carefully considered the terms of reference to the proposed committee and have come to the conclusion that no enquiry within the limited scope and extent prescribed can yield satisfactory results. It will no doubt be possible for the committee to discover 'the difficulties arising from or defects inherent in the working of the Government of India Act and the rules thereunder', and suggest remedies within the limitations laid down, but it is obvious that no such remedies can meet the requirements of the situation. A reference to the terms of the resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly on the 18th February, 1924 will show that the action contemplated by that resolution must necessarily go beyond 'the structure, policy and purpose of the Act' and that the object in view cannot be served by merely rectifying 'any administrative imperfections'. The proposed enquiry would perhaps be justifiable if its real and avowed purpose were to collect evidence to be subsequently placed before a representative conference constituted in the manner described in the resolution of the Assembly, with unrestricted powers to propose such changes in the constitution as the circumstances required. But as I read the press communique, it commits those who

<sup>1</sup>Gandhi Papers.

<sup>2</sup>The Leader, 6 June 1924. Motilal Nehru's letter dated 2 June to the Joint Secretary to Government of India.

37. *Telegram to Colonel Wedgwood*<sup>1</sup>

Col Wedgwood  
House of Commons  
London

Govt. India's upresponsive attitude compelled Party reject Finance Bill  
Broad minded statesmanship alone will save situation.

Nehru  
19.3.24

38. *Telegram to S.R. Bomanji*<sup>2</sup>

Bomanji<sup>3</sup>  
London

Your telegram Rejection Finance Bill only fitting answer to Government  
Indias arrogant unyielding attitude stop No objection meeting in conference  
if conditions satisfactory.

Nehru  
Anand Bhawan, Allahabad  
24.3.1924

39. *To Party Members*<sup>4</sup>

Delhi, March 24

Dear Friends,

It being inadvisable to proceed with the Bill of Dr. Gour for repeal of the Criminal Law Amendment Act on Tuesday next, I have decided to leave for Allahabad tonight.

I am sorry to have to take leave of you so abruptly before the close of the session. It is important that I should see Mahatma Gandhi at Bombay before Lala Lajpat Rai sails for England on the 1st of April next. By leaving tonight I will be able to spend three days with my people at home in Allahabad which would otherwise be impossible in these circumstances. I hope you will excuse me for not waiting in Delhi for the garden party you have so kindly arranged

<sup>1</sup>*Motilal Nehru Papers.*

<sup>2</sup>*Motilal Nehru Papers.*

<sup>3</sup>S.R. Bomanji; b. 1868 at Bombay; landlord, millowner and a prominent Bombay politician; founded the *Bombay Chronicle* in 1913 along with Sir Pherozeshah Mehta; was also one of the owners of *Bombay Samachar*; participated in the Home Rule movement; settled down in the United States in the early 1920s; worked for India's cause in Great Britain and U.S.A.; later retired to Paris; d. 1951.

<sup>4</sup>*Forward*, 26 March 1924.

bad. If you go after Ahmedabad with me you can escort Mama & Betty back to Allahabad.

Your loving  
Father

### 43. To Jawahar<sup>1</sup>

Solon  
15.6.24

My dear Jawahar,

I enclose my programme. You will see that I am taking 12 days here which I expect will set me up for the next three months and also make the journey to Ahmedabad more bearable. You will perhaps be able to go to Rajkot about the same time as I & after a short stay return to Allahabad with Mama & Betty. Kamla told me she was going back during the first week of July. This will synchronize with the arrival of the Rajkot party. I will follow 10 days later but my stay in Allahabad will not be more than a week as a meeting of the Swarajya Party will be held in Calcutta about the 24th July.

As for the upkeep of Anand Bhawan you are now saying what I said three years ago. I would let things drift for another 6 months as they have been doing all these years. I expect to be able to fix myself up one way or another by the end of the year. We shall then see what is to be done with Anand Bhawan.

You might have heard of a "Taxation Committee" appointed by the Govt. The idea is to examine the incidence of the present taxes on the population with a view to relieve hardships and explore fresh sources of taxation. The latter I think is the real object. A resolution has been tabled by the Swarajya Party substituting an enquiry into the economic condition of the people by an elected committee for the nominated Govt. Committee on taxation and disapproving of the personnel of the latter on which the only non-officials are the Maharaja of Burdwan<sup>2</sup> & Paranjpye.<sup>3</sup> The finance member offered to appoint a nominee of mine as a bribe for the withdrawal of the resolution. I refused to accept the bribe but in the course of the conversation which followed I happened to name *Hinday Nath Kunzru* as more competent than any of

<sup>1</sup>Jawaharlal Nehru Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Sir Bijay Chand Mahtab, Maharaja of Burdwan; b. 1881; member, Bengal Legislative Council, 1907-08, Imperial Legislative Council, 1909-12, Bengal Executive Council, 1919-24, Indian Reforms Enquiry Committee, 1924, Indian Taxation Enquiry Committee, 1924-25, Council of State, 1926-27; d. 1941.

<sup>3</sup>R.P. Paranjpye; b. 1876; Principal and Professor of Mathematics, Fergusson College, Poona, 1902-24, member, Bombay Legislative Council, 1913-20; Vice-Chancellor, Indian Women's University, 1916-20; Minister, Bombay Government, 1921-23, 1927; member, Secretary of State's Council, 1927-31; Vice-Chancellor, Lucknow University, 1932-38; Indian High Commissioner in Australia, 1944-47; Vice-Chancellor, Poona University, 1956-59; d. 1966.

comprehensively so as to include in it all changes of policy and programme that may be found necessary from time to time.

(ii) Fix Re 1/- as annual subscription for members out of which As. 4 to go to the Congress & As 12 to be retained by the Party. It is obvious that we must swell our numbers in the Congress.

(b) I would have all Swarajist M.L.A.s & M.L.C.s as Ex-officio members of the G.C. and a proportion to be elected by the Provinces. It is not necessary to constitute the A.I.C.C. as an electorate for the G.C. of the Party or to have any Ex-officio members from the A.I.C.C. Our endeavour will be to fill the A.I.C.C. with Swarajists. Executive Committee to be elected by G.C.

(c) General power to frame rules to carry out the aims & objects as defined in (a) above.

A meeting of the G.C. will be called immediately after to carry out (c) above, and we shall in future only have to deal with the General Council which will I hope develop into our House of Commons in course of time. I leave now on the 4th at 19.30 arrive Ahmedabad on the 5th at 7.24—Leave Ahmedabad on the 6th at 21.45 arriving in Bombay on the 7th at 8.45. This means a change in the original programme which has become necessary by the events of the last few days.

I have three objects in visiting Ahmedabad again—1st to have a final talk with Mahatmaji after giving him time to ponder over the happenings of last week—2nd to obtain some grease for our machinery which is running absolutely dry. I have already explored the sources of supply, the only doubt is as to the quantity available—3rd to organise a Swaraj Party in Ahmedabad on sound practical lines. For this purpose I shall have no hesitation in anticipating the Calcutta decisions.

From the 7th to the 15th I shall stay in Bombay with one day's absence at Poona which I have promised Kelkar. The 2nd & the 3rd objects mentioned above will be pursued in Bombay with a little or no interference from Patel to whom I have practically bid good-bye in Simla. I have plainly told him and the Nationalist Party that his mentality is so different from mine that it is impossible for us to act together. Tata<sup>1</sup> has invited me to stay with him but I do not wish to give a handle to Patel and prefer to put up at the old place in Laburnum Road.

I am not for wasting time over public meetings but feel that it is desirable for me to address at least one meeting. I leave this to you.

Yours sincerely  
Motilal Nehru

<sup>1</sup>Rattanji Dadabhai Tata, b. 1856; son of Dadabhai, brother-in-law of Jamssetji Tata; educated at Elphinstone College, Bombay; joined his father's firm at Hong Kong and took charge of it in 1883; partner in the Empress Mills, 1884, Tata Sons, 1907; had close contacts with Motilal Nehru and in the 1920s, organised funds for the Swarajists; Chairman, Tata Iron and Steel Company, 1922; d. 1926.

the Govt. nominees. The F. member jumped at the idea & said he would appoint him straightaway after a formal reference to the U.P. Govt. I made it clear that this would not affect the principle or the objection to the other two Indian members. Blackett (the F. member) said "I take no promise from you but trust to your generosity." "I have to be just before I am generous" was my reply "I leave that to you" he said & the conversation ended. So Hirday Nath will have Rs 3000 a month for a year or more and a Saloon to travel in. I phoned to him the substance of the conversation and he was quite excited over it. Later Blackett phoned to me to ask Hirday Nath to see him. I communicated the message to Hirday Nath and am expecting him here any moment as he wanted to see me after his conversation with Blackett. While I am glad to have helped Hirday Nath I am greatly annoyed at having unconsciously got mixed up with a Govt. proposal. They are a clever lot but will I hope find it impossible to rope me in.

Your loving  
Father

44. To M.R. Jayakar<sup>1</sup>

Rajkot  
2.7.24

My dear Jayakar,

Your telegram arrived just in time to enable me to recall a number of telegrams I had sent out for despatch to the various Provinces fixing the 27th July for the Party meeting in Calcutta. I have now sent a first set of telegrams asking each Province the date & duration of its next Council meeting. My impression is that the U.P. and the Panjab Councils meet in August and I wish to avoid their dates if possible. We cannot delay the Party meeting indefinitely and the revised programme of work both inside and outside the Council should be issued by the middle of August. I should therefore like to fix the meeting on the 3rd August as many Swarajists in Calcutta on whom we mainly rely are practising lawyers and any day other than a Sunday will perhaps not suit them. The next Sunday falls on the 10th which will be too late.

The idea is to give the General Council all the powers of the whole Party as it is next to impossible to have a satisfactory meeting of the whole Party at any time or place. I would therefore confine the general meeting of the Party to the following agenda:

- (a) Constitution of Party & terms of membership.
- (b) Constitution of the General Council & the Executive Committee.
- (c) General delegation of power to the General Council in the matters covering the policy & programme of the Party.

As regards

- (a) I would (i) define the aims & objects of the Party more clearly and

<sup>1</sup>M.R. Jayakar Papers.

I have given a very short answer to the first count of the charge. You will, no doubt, wish to have an explanation and I have no hesitation in giving it. As I have made clear to you from time to time, my agreement with you on several items of your programme is not based on the identical grounds upon which you rely and, if I have come to the same conclusions as you have, it is on purely political or economic and sometimes also moral grounds, having no reference whatever to the religious beliefs of any section of the Congress. My religion is my country, and I am prepared to serve it honestly and truthfully with all my heart and soul through thick and thin according to my own lights unaffected by all the religious dogmas in the world. For the present we are only concerned with the drink question, and in that connection I will trouble you with a very brief personal history.

Before and after I joined the N.C.O. movement I was a believer in moderate drinking by those who had full control on themselves—I am here reminded of another Persian couplet which freely translated runs:—"It is wrong to say that wine makes men disreputable; the truth is that men bring wine into disrepute". In fact, during the 40 years preceding March 1921 I had seldom missed my evening drink for 11 months in the year. I abstained for one month in every year simply to avoid getting enslaved to the habit. I have, however, always believed that the general habit of drinking in any country is a fruitful source of social and economic evils and that it is better even for those who have sufficient self-restraint to give it up if only to set an example to their weaker brethren. I have so far never taken any active part in the anti-drink campaign but when it was begun by others in right earnest at your bidding I felt it was only right for me who was in the general movement to give up even the harmless stimulant I had allowed myself after the day's hard work for years past. The moment this feeling came upon me all alcoholic drinks became a thing of the past and for nearly three years I never thought of them. Early in December last, however, it so happened that after addressing a number of Council election meetings held on the roadside for a distance of about 100 miles my chauffeur lost his way in the dark and it was not till long after midnight that I reached my destination literally shivering from cold. My great coat having been left behind I had nothing but a thin shawl over my Khaddar shirt to protect me from the bitterly cold blast of a December night in the U.P. to which I was exposed for hours. I arrived at my destination with the feeling that the very marrow in my bones had frozen. With some difficulty I obtained a bottle of brandy and a couple of ounces taken in hot water at once spread a genial warmth in my body. The bottle was kept in reserve for similar occasions and did good service from time to time.

45. To Mahatma Gandhi<sup>1</sup>

"Soonita"

Ridge Road,

Malabar Hill,

Bombay, 10th July 1924.

My dear Mahatmaji,

Your letter of the 3rd July addressed to Rajkot and redirected here reached me day before yesterday. I have met you twice at Sabarmati since you wrote that letter but you said nothing about it evidently because there were more important topics to engage our attention. This is unfortunate, as a personal talk on the subject of your letter, besides being more satisfactory, would have saved much of your time and mine. I am sorry I cannot have the pleasure of seeing you for some time to come and have no option now but to put down my views on paper. I made several unsuccessful attempts to write in my own hand but was so often interrupted that I had finally to obtain the help of a stenotypist. I hope the long rigmarole I am going to inflict on you will cause less trouble in type.

Let me at the outset assure you that so far from regarding your request for information as an "abuse of the privilege of friendship" I look upon it as your right as well as your duty to know where you stand with those who, in spite of your public declaration of distrust in them, are trying for all they are worth to be able to work with and under you.

I am in ignorance of the exact terms of the information laid against me as also of the identity of my accuser as these have not been disclosed to me, but as far as I can gather from your letter the charge divides itself into two counts: (1) that I have drunk wine publicly and (2) that I said in the course of an after-dinner speech that "water has been called pure, but wine is made after being thrice distilled. It is, therefore, purer than water."

My answer to the first count is an unqualified "Yes". As to the second, I am sure I did not institute any comparison between the respective merits of wine and water. The statement as reported is too silly even for an after-dinner speech. I have not seen that speech reported anywhere, but to the best of my recollection the expression "thrice distilled" was used by me in reference to a brand of liquor brandy which was going round as I was speaking and bore on the label the year 1835. The allusion was to the well-known description of a good wine in Persian poetry as *derina* (old) and *seh atisha* (thrice distilled). What I meant to convey was that the host of the evening had provided a temptation which had gone far beyond the imagination of the Persian poets. There were many good Muslims at this dinner who drank nothing but pure water. They heartily applauded my remarks and never for a moment dreamt that I was chaffing at them or at teetotalism. I think I can reproduce what I said almost verbatim but it will serve no useful purpose to re-construct a stale after-dinner speech which ceased to have any interest to anybody soon after it was delivered.



48. To Mahatma Gandhi<sup>1</sup>

"Soonita"  
Ridge Road  
Malabar Hill  
25th July 24

Dear Mahatmaji,

I enclose a copy of the questions I handed to Maulana Mohammad Ali on his recent visit to Allahabad for favour of written replies. He was putting up with us and was in Allahabad for a whole day after the questions were handed to him. When he was leaving I reminded him of them but he only said that there was some misapprehension and referred me to Moulvi Rafi Ahmad<sup>2</sup> for further information. This gentleman was standing by and he at once protested his ignorance but the Maulana made some humorous remark and left immediately after. I then asked Jawaharlal if he knows whether the Maulana Saheb intended to answer the questions at all—he said he could not [say]. There is, of course, no obligation on the Maulana Saheb to answer these or any other questions but in the absence of clear replies I am left to draw my own inferences which may or may not be correct.

I may mention that the facts referred to in Qs. 3 & 4 have been established to my satisfaction by reliable evidence. I should like very much to know what you think of them. If I could have your views on the remaining questions also it would greatly help me in shaping my own course of action.

I shall be in Bombay for four or five days. Will you kindly let me know when you are arriving here?

With regards,

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

*Questions submitted by Pandit Motilal Nehru to Maulana Mohammad Ali, President of the Indian National Congress, for favour of answers.*

*Questions:*

1. Is it your interpretation of the resolutions passed by the All-India Congress Committee at its last meeting held at Ahmedabad, read with the relevant resolutions passed by the Congress at Delhi and Cocanada, that it is open to No-changers to carry on active propaganda in the country against Council-entry?
2. If so, do you agree that it is equally open to Swarajists to carry on counter-propaganda?
3. Is it true that you and Maulana Shaukat Ali have already begun active

<sup>1</sup>*Gandhi Papers*

<sup>2</sup>Rafi Ahmed Kidwai; b. 1894, Muslim leader from U.P.; took part in the non-cooperation movement; Secretary to Motilal Nehru; member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1926-29; Minister, U.P., 1937-39, 1946-47, member, Congress Working Committee, 1947-51; resigned from the Congress and joined K.M.P.F., 1951; Union Minister for Food and Agriculture 1952-54; d. 1954.

20th —Leave Allahabad 9.0  
 21st —Arrive Poona—19.0  
 22nd & 23rd Halt  
 23rd —Leave Poona 23.0  
 24th —Arrive Bombay 7.45  
 24th to 26th Halt  
 26th —Leave Bombay 21.0  
 27th —Arrive Allahabad 1.30  
 27th [July] to 7th [Aug.] Halt  
 8th —Leave Allahabad (noon)  
 9th —Arrive Calcutta 6.30  
 9th to 13th Halt

Your loving  
 Father

#### 47. To Kantilal Parekh<sup>1</sup>

"Soonita"  
 Ridge Road  
 Malabar Hill  
 12.7.24

Dear Parekh<sup>2</sup>,

How strange I do not find your Grand Pa's<sup>3</sup> name in the telephone directory. I have been here for the last four days but could not find the time to write. I am going to Allahabad tomorrow night. I hope you will receive this letter before I leave.

I shall be found at the above address (R.D. Tata's house) till 1 p.m. After that I shall go out & not return till about 7 p.m. in time to have my dinner & go to the station. Try to see me.

Yours sincerely  
 Motilal Nehru

<sup>1</sup>Motilal Nehru Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Kantilal Gokuldas Parekh; b. 1896 at Bombay; advocate, Bombay High Court; took part in the movement for the boycott of the Prince of Wales visit to Calcutta, 1921; Secretary, Burra Bazar Congress Committee, Calcutta; member, A.I.C.C., 1922-40; Honorary Personal Secretary to C.R. Das, 1922-25; took active part in the organisation of Swaraj Party in Bengal, 1922-23; participated in the Bardoli satyagraha, 1928 and imprisoned for six months; organised the publication of the *Bombay Congress Bulletin* in 1930-31 from his own house, along with Subhas Chandra Bose, formed and organised the Forward Bloc in 1939; expelled from the Congress for six years along with Veer Nariman; d. 1982.

<sup>3</sup>Sir Gokuldas Kabandas Parekh; b. 1847 at Umreth, Gujarat; educated at Bombay University, joined Government High School, Surat as a teacher, 1871; resigned and set up legal practice, 1880, pleader, Bombay High Court; member, Bombay Legislative Council, 1897-1920, social reformer; defended the cause of Gujarat people for heavy land assessment in the famine of 1897 and instituted inquiries into land revenue collection, 1899-1900; was popularly known as *Khedutona Pua* (Father of the farmers), attended the Social Conference held at Bombay, 1904, President, Gujarat Political Conference, Surat, 1919, d. 1925.

The telegrams I sent you yesterday and the day before have not yet been answered, and the funniest part of it all is that I have to depend upon press cables from London for information about your movements. I do hope I shall hear from you before I leave Bombay on Tuesday night for Allahabad.

I do not know what truth there is in the rumour that you intend to visit England shortly. If you have already made up your mind, it is no use discussing it, but in case you have not I wish to give you a tip which might be useful. Sometime ago I wrote to Lajpat Rai, and told him that there was a chance of my seeing him in London before he came back. This I expected to do in connection with the Privy Council appeal in the Allahabad case which I had reserved at the time of giving up practice. Lajpat Rai's reply was received the other day in which he stated that he had mentioned the matter to some of our Labour friends in office who gave it as their opinion that it would not be right for me to go to England unasked by the Cabinet or the India Office as sooner or later they were bound to invite you and me. You will remember that there was a rumour in April last that you, Gandhiji and myself were being invited by the Labour Government to a conference in London on which a question was put in the House of Commons. The official answer was that no such invitation had been issued. The real fact, as I came to know subsequently, was that they had actually asked the Government of India to invite us on their behalf, but the idea was given up when the Government of India protested against it. These facts may, perhaps be of some help to you in coming to a final decision about your intended visit if you have not already made up your mind.

After dictating so far I got a telegram from Mrs. Das<sup>1</sup> saying that you were in Dacca. There seems to be some mystery attached to your rumoured visit to London. Otherwise I should have expected Mrs. Das to give some definite information on the subject instead of merely saying that you were in Dacca. I hope you will return by the time this letter reaches Calcutta.

I have had the greatest difficulties in collecting funds for the party. After many vicissitudes of fortune there is a fair chance of my leaving in the Bank here a sum considerably over Rs 1 lakh besides obtaining the entire control of the policy and management of the *Bombay Chronicle*. We want a much larger sum to organize ourselves throughout the country, and Gandhiji's recent utterances leave no option to us but to have a trial of strength at Belgaum. Your absence from the country at this juncture will be disastrous. I do not know how you are going to manage the Bengal Council meeting which is to be held at the end of August under the new rules recently made. Every moment of our time is most precious, and I feel that I shall be entirely helpless if you desert me. During the last six months I have not spent quite six days in Allahabad and have been constantly on the move. I cannot do more. The September Session of the Assembly requires a great deal of spade work to be done, and I have to do it all single-handed.

propaganda against Council-entry and have actually tried at Lucknow to use your influence to persuade Swarajist members of Legislative Councils to come out ?

4. Is it true that either you or Maulana Shaukat Ali or both have put it to the Swarajists and other Congressmen that the issue was whether they would accept Mahatma Gandhi or Pandit Motilal Nehru as their leader ?

5 Are you working to secure a majority to obtain a verdict of the forthcoming Congress

(i) generally in favour of any resolutions which Mahatma Gandhi may wish to submit to the Congress ?

(ii) specially

(a) to rescind the compromise resolutions passed at the Delhi and Cocanada Sessions relating to Council-entry

(b) to re-introduce the penalty clause in the resolution relating to hand-spinning passed by the All-India Congress Committee at Ahmedabad, and

(c) to exclude all Swarajists from membership of the All-India Congress Committee and the various Provincial, District and Tahsil Congress Committees.

6. If your answer to any part of the preceding question is in the affirmative, do you agree that it is open to Swarajists to carry on counter-propaganda ?

7. (a) Do you agree that the All-India Congress Committee and the various Provincial, District and Tahsil Committees though loosely described as the executive of the Congress are really deliberative bodies consisting of hundreds of members and that each has a small council of its own to transact purely executive business ?

(b) If so, is it the intention to exclude Swarajists from the pure executive only in the Central and Provincial Organizations or also from the larger deliberative bodies mentioned above ?

Handed to Maulana Mohammad Ali at Allahabad on 18.7.1924

M.N.

49. To C.R. Das<sup>1</sup>

"Soonita",  
Ridge Road,  
Malabar Hill,  
Bombay,  
27th July 1924

My dear Chitta,

You are getting more and more hopeless in the matter of correspondence.

<sup>1</sup>Motilal Nehru Papers.

- (1) To revise the policy, constitution and programme of the party.
- (2) To elect the office-bearers and members of the General Council.
- (3) To transact such other business as may be brought forward with the permission of the Chair.

The General Council elected at the General Meeting of the party will meet at a time and place to be announced immediately after the party meeting to transact the following business:—

(1) Election of Committees and disposal of such matters as may be referred to the General Council by the party meeting by a special resolution or under the constitution and rules as revised.

(2) To consider the rules recommended for confirmation by the members of the Swarajya Party in the Legislative Assembly and the Provincial Legislative Councils.

There is a general desire to reconstitute the General Council so as to include in it all the Swarajist members of the Assembly and the Provincial Legislatures besides a proportion to be elected by each province. In anticipation of this desire being given effect to it is particularly requested that all Swarajist members of the Assembly and the Provincial Legislatures will make a point of attending the party meeting on the 10th August. Provinces which have not yet elected the allotted number of members to the General Council under the existing rules are requested to do so as early as possible, and communicate the names of the members elected to the General Secretary at Allahabad.

A sufficient number of copies of the rules made by members of Provincial Councils which require confirmation by the General Council should be supplied to the General Secretary in good time before the party meeting.

Members who require accommodation in Calcutta will kindly communicate with Babu Satyendra Chandra Mitra, General Secretary, Bengal Provincial Swarajya Committee, 9 Russa Road North, Calcutta.

51. To Rangaswami Iyengar<sup>1</sup>

"Soonita"  
Ridge Road,  
Malabar Hill,  
Bombay,  
27th July 1924

Dear Rangaswami,

I have your letter of the 22nd July and the two Bills you have drafted. I have not had time to consider the latter very carefully, but will write or wire from Allahabad. I do not think we need wait till the 10th August to make up our minds about these Bills, and the sooner notice of them is given to the Legislative Department the better it will be. I note that Patel has not given you any notice of the Bills he has published in the press. I find that rules Nos.

I am writing separately to Satyendra Chandra Mitra<sup>1</sup> about the meetings on 10th August and the following days. I expect to arrive in Calcutta on the morning of the 9th.

Yours affectionately,  
(Motilal Nehru)

50. To Satyendra Chandra Mitra<sup>2</sup>

"Soonita"  
Ridge Road,  
Malabar Hill,  
Bombay,  
27th July 1924

Dear Satyendra Babu,

I am sorry I could not reply to your letter of the 17th July earlier, as I received it just when I was leaving Allahabad on my present tour. I am enclosing an agenda for the meetings of the party and the General Council to be held in Calcutta on the 10th August and subsequent days. I am sorry I have no records here to give you the names of the Secretaries of the different Provincial Swarajya Committees or their addresses. I am, however, writing to Allahabad to furnish you with such information as is available in the Office, and will thank you to communicate with the Provinces directly. Please fill up the gaps in the agenda I am enclosing and hand it to the Associated Press for publication; also send copies to the Secretaries of the various Provincial Committees and have it published in extenso in the leading dailies.

Yours sincerely  
(Motilal Nehru)

Babu Satyendra Chandra Mitra,  
Genl. Secy. Bengal Provincial Swarajya Committee,  
9, Russa Road North,  
Calcutta

#### NOTICE

Agenda of the General Meeting of the Swarajya Party to be held in Calcutta at — on the 10th August 1924 at—

<sup>1</sup>Satyendra Chandra Mitra; b. 1888, lawyer; leader of the Jugantar; arrested, 1916; Secretary, Bengal P.C.C., 1922-24, elected to the Bengal Legislative Council in 1924; arrested, 1924; elected to the Indian Legislative Assembly while still in Mandalay jail, 1926, unconditionally released, August 1927, Chief Whip of the Swaraj Party in the Assembly, 1927; Chairman, Bengal Legislative Council, 1937-41; d. 1942.

<sup>2</sup>*Motilal Nehru Papers.*

who attend your meeting tomorrow after correcting verbal mistakes if any.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

53. To Mahatma Gandhi<sup>1</sup>

"Soonita",  
Ridge Road  
Malabar Hill  
July 28, 1924

Dear Mahatmaji,

Thanks for your letter answering some of the questions I put to Maulana Mohammad Ali.

After I sent you my last letter enclosing a copy of the questions, I read in the papers that you had lost considerable weight and were suffering from headache and occasional fever. Please pardon me for troubling you with the questions in your present state of health. I would not have done so had I seen the papers before writing.

I am now getting very anxious about your health. The most obvious thing to do is to stop all work at once and take complete rest. But the misfortune is that you will not do this. All great men have their weaknesses and sometimes they are more than those of ordinary men. Specially in matters concerning the care of their own persons. You recognize the fact that you are not physically fit for the work you have undertaken and yet will not do the one thing which everybody including yourself knows has to be done to restore you to your normal state of health! I do not know any name for that other than national misfortune.

I shall be perfectly frank with you even at the risk of offending you. Let me tell you plainly that the kind of work you are doing at present can very well wait and that the nation will not be in the least poorer if it is not done at all and if in its place we have our Gandhi restored to health and vigour at the end of say a month or even two months. I should cut you off from all communication with India for a time and send you out in the open sea for a fairly long cruise without any land being in sight for six weeks. The least that you can do is to take a trip to see Ceylon where you will have an entire change of surroundings. Your *dak* should await you at the Ashram during your absence. But it is useless to go on writing in this strain. I am afraid I can make no impression on you and there is nothing for us but to resign ourselves to whatever the future has in store for us. I have however made up my mind about one thing and that is that I will not be a *particeps criminis* in the suicide you are committing by troubling you with any further correspondence or talk about any work however urgent it may be until you have very considerably improved your health.

22 and 29 framed by us at Simla are defective in this respect, as they seem to contemplate only such motions, amendments or bills as are handed in to the Legislative Department during the continuance of a Session. The ballots for motions and bills received during the recess are generally fixed to take place on dates prior to the commencement of the Session. There is no rule to cover such motions and bills. I find that some members have already taken upon themselves to notify bills and motions of a more or less fantastic nature. The very fact of the publication of such bills and motions brings ridicule upon the party. When the rules framed at Simla come up for confirmation by the General Council we should supply all deficiencies and defects and make them complete. I would ask you to go through them with that object and note the changes that you consider necessary.

I enclose an agenda for the meeting of the 10th August. I have asked Satyendra Chandra Mitra to fill up the gaps and circulate it to the Provinces and also to publish it in the press.

I wired to you yesterday to suggest the name of a Chief Editor of Swarajist views to take charge of the *Bombay Chronicle*. My negotiations are nearly complete. I am staying here to give them final shape and form. Judgment is expected in the suit for damages tomorrow. We shall then know exactly what amount of money is required to tide over the present difficulty, and put the paper on a sound footing. I intend returning to Allahabad on Tuesday or Wednesday night. Meanwhile, I shall be very busy in carrying out the principal object of my visit, and before we meet in Calcutta I hope to have the wherewithal for an extensive organization of the party in the country.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

A. Rangaswami Iyengar Esqr.,  
Editor, *Swadesamitran*<sup>1</sup>  
Madras.

52. To M.R. Jayakar<sup>2</sup>

"Soonita"  
Ridge Road  
Malabar Hill  
27.7.24

My dear Jayakar,

I have hurriedly dictated the accompanying note. The words were typed as they fell from my lips and I have no time to revise them as the dinner bell has gone & there are people waiting for me. Please read this to the Swarajists

<sup>1</sup>*Swadesamitran* was a Tamil daily started as a weekly in 1882 by G. Subramania Iyer from Madras. It was converted into a tri-weekly in 1897 and a daily in 1899.

<sup>2</sup>M. R. Jayakar Papers.



The position as regards the *Chronicle* is that in consultation with F.E. I have laid down two essential conditions. (1) that the Chief Editor should be my nominee & (2) that Lalji and another friend of ours to be selected by F.E. to look to the management side should be added as Directors. I have sent a letter cablegram to Lala Lajpat Rai to discuss recent events personally with Horniman & find out if he is prepared to support the Swarajist policy and programme.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

The party meeting has been postponed to the 16th Aug. as the 10th was an important day of the *Moharram*. I shall leave on the 14th & arrive in Calcutta on the morning of the 15th. I hope you will also arrive on the 15th.

M.N.

55. To S.A. Brelvi<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
4.8.24

My dear Brelvi,

I was glad to receive your letter. If it were not for the fact that I knew I could thoroughly rely on you I should never have agreed to be on the Board of Directors. This I think is a sufficient answer to your letter.

I wired to you yesterday about the Bombay Rent Bill and to Jayakar at the same time to put you in possession of all the facts. I enclose<sup>2</sup> the memorandum I sent to the Bombay Councillors on the subject. You know Patel is out for mischief. Jamnadas Mehta is his unwilling agent & Lieutenant. He hates him like poison but somehow or other cannot get away from his influence. Both are shady characters and each knows too much of the other. This is the secret. Please do not be misled by any agitation manufactured by them.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

<sup>1</sup>S.A. Brelvi Papers.

<sup>2</sup>See Appendix III, 3.

Your postcard must be awaiting my return to Allahabad. I am going back day after tomorrow night. I should have run up to Sabarmati for a day if I thought I could be of any use whatever. But I expect no good to come out of my visit and have therefore given up the idea. Let me however ask you a question. Would you put me down as mad if I were to ask you to spend a few weeks on the bank of the Ganges some five miles out of Allahabad at a garden house belonging to a friend of mine which is at my entire disposal? This is the only alternative to your going out to sea that I can think of for the benefit of your health.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

54. To M.R. Jayakar<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan  
Allahabad  
2.8.24

My dear Jayakar,

Things brightened up a bit after I wrote to you my last letter from Poona, and I have been assured of something like 1½ lakhs within the next 10 days & a similar amount before the 15th Novr. This does not include the people in charge of our friend Lalji<sup>2</sup> as F.E<sup>3</sup> & Sir P<sup>4</sup> were not in touch with them. I have just written to Lalji and asked him to try & see that his wards contribute their quota within the 10 days. The work before me is a huge one. Kindly see him and tell him that the amount promised is nothing compared to what is required to organise the whole country which I have undertaken to do.

I am sorry I could not find time to meet the Sobani brothers<sup>5</sup> and speak to them about the reports of the Bombay Council proceedings. I have however written to them.

<sup>1</sup>M.R. Jayakar Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Lalji Naranji, b. 1878, Orthodox Cutchi Bhatia; piece goods dealer, landlord, millowner; proprietor of Mulji Jaiha and Co.; started Shri Ranjitsinghji Mills, Sholapur, 1907 and Jupiter Insurance Company, 1919; member, Indian Stores Committee, 1920, President, Indian Merchants' Chamber, 1920-21, 1926; member, Bombay Legislative Council, 1923-30; collected funds for the Swaraj Party; Vice-President, Bombay Millowners' Association, 1929; Trustee, Bombay Port Trust, 1921-34, was director of eighteen joint stock companies; leader of Backbay Reclamation agitation; d. 1934.

<sup>3</sup>F.E. Dinshaw; b. 1873; prince of Bombay's financiers and industrialists; popularly known as "F.E."; passed LL.B. in 1895 and became a solicitor; financial agent of the Maharaja Scindia of Gwalior in Bombay; d. 1936.

<sup>4</sup>Purshotamdas Thakurdas; b. 1879, industrialist; member, Indian Retrenchment Committee, 1922-23, Council of State, 1922-23, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1923-30, Royal Commission on Indian Currency and Finance, 1926, delegate to the Round Table Conferences, 1930-32; d. 1961.

<sup>5</sup>Umar Sobhani and Osman Sobhani.

make up its mind definitely whether it is going to have them or us. It cannot have both. When this question is decided it will be time for us to think of infusing fresh blood into the Party. For these reasons I have suggested that you might send me a complaint with specific charges against Patel and Jamnadas of having behaved in a manner calculated to bring the whole Party into contempt and ridicule. All you need do is to state categorically such acts and observations of Patel and Jamnadas as were calculated to have that effect. I shall formally serve a copy on both of them and give them notice that the matter would be laid before the meeting of the Party at Calcutta. I am positively of opinion that we must end the present unsatisfactory state of things and purge the Party of all undesirable elements.

With you the case is different. You are the party directly assailed and it is right and proper that you should publish your own version of the facts justifying the action you took. For the rest you must try and bring as many Swarajist Councillors of your view as you can to Calcutta and arrive there a clear day before the meeting. I note what you say about our friend Lalji. I believe he is already in active participation with us. Before leaving Bombay I impressed on Mr. F.E. Dinshaw that he should treat two points as conditions precedent to the floating of a debenture loan or tendering any other financial help to the *Chronicle*. These conditions were (1) that Lalji and another person with experience of the business to be selected by F.E. himself should be added to the Board of Directors, and (2) that the permanent editor must be a man of my choice. It is now for the Sobani brothers to formally elect Lalji as a director. I can only tell him what I have myself done. I am writing to him separately.

I do not see why you say it is unfortunate that Piethall<sup>1</sup> has given the change of *Chronicle's* policy as a reason for his resignation. Everybody knows that Piethall had no policy except boosting Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali and repeating what Mahatmaji said from time to time. As for Venkatram he is one of the greatest rascals unhung that I have ever known. We know that he would give trouble when we disallowed his bill for remuneration and gave him notice to leave. If there are any actual defalcations to the credit of the Sobanis I do not mind in the least their being thoroughly exposed. So far as we are concerned we have nothing to fear from Venkatram.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

Syt. M.R. Jayakar  
Barrister  
391, Thakurdwar, Bombay.

<sup>1</sup>M.W. Pichhall, b. 1875, novelist and journalist; became Muslim in 1918; Editor, *Bombay Chronicle*, 1920-24, entered Nizam's Educational Service in 1925, retired, 1935; Principal, Government High School, Chadarghat, Superintendent, Hyderabad Civil Service class, Director of Information, Editor, *Islamic Culture*; translated the *Quran*, 1930, d. 1936.

56. *Telegram to M.R. Jayakar*<sup>1</sup>

7 Aug. 1924

Barrister Jayakar  
399 Thakurdwar Bombay

Your letter I stand by you but consider press statement inadvisable in view forthcoming Calcutta meeting where you should claim party's formal decision meanwhile publish memorandum I sent you at Poona and attend Calcutta with largest possible number Swarajist Councillors stop Brelvi has copy of my memorandum stop give me formal notice of specific charges against Patel and Jamnadas to be served on them immediately writing.

Nehru

57. *To M R. Jayakar*<sup>2</sup>

Anand Bhawan  
Allahabad  
7th August 1924

My dear Jayakar,

It was very painful to read your letter and the cuttings accompanying it. I have just sent you a long wire which will speak for itself. Your letter of the 5th was received immediately after I had sent my telegram.

I feel that by taking any part in the controversy at the present moment I would be guilty of the very offence with which we are charging Patel and Jamnadas. They have created the very unbecoming position of the leader of the Bombay Swarajya Party outside the Council publicly charging the leader of the Party in the Bombay Council with serious dereliction of duty. It is however necessary to publish the part I took in this matter before Patel took up the cudgels against you. I have therefore suggested in my wire that the memorandum I sent you at Poona from Bombay and which was read by you at a meeting of the Swarajist members may be published in support of your action. In case you have mislaid your copy I have mentioned the fact that Brelvi has another copy which I sent to him on receipt of your first letter.

I am sorry to note the desponding tone of your letter of the 5th August. I do not see any cause for despair. On the contrary it is as well that matters have come to a head and can now be dealt with so as to settle finally the respective places of Patel and ourselves in the Party. I do not think the remedy lies in our associating Jinnah and friends like him with ourselves. By doing so we shall be playing into the hands of Patel and Jamnadas. It is quite clear now that we cannot work with these two men. It is for the Party to

<sup>1</sup>*M.R. Jayakar Papers.*<sup>2</sup>*M.R. Jayakar Papers.*

heading "Raising the Wind." On a careful consideration of the article and the insinuations and implications underlying it I have no doubt in my mind that it affords ample material to enable me to compel *The Times of India* to be an unwilling subscriber to the Swarajya Party Funds. The description of what I did during my recent visit to Bombay as "Raising the Wind" coupled with the parable of the "succulent lizard," the "Swarajist Pandits assuming the serpentine role." The "danger of the Bombay Mill Owners playing the self-sacrificing part of the iguana lizard", "my alleged anxiety to swell the exiguous Party fund which I have at my disposal" and other similar remarks can only lead the ordinary reader unaware of the true facts to believe that I have been guilty of some kind of discreditable and disgraceful conduct not far removed from obtaining money on false pretences. Let me inform you that the boycott of Law Courts no longer stands in my way and if I do not instruct my lawyers at once it is simply because I cannot spare the time required for legal proceedings just at present. I have therefore decided without waiving my right of action on the article in question to give you a *locus poenitentiae* if you will have it. I accordingly call upon you to place the true facts before the public by publishing this letter.

The facts are these—When I was at Juhu in April-May last a baseless rumour was started that I was treating with the Tatas in the matter of steel protection. In contradicting that rumour in the course of a press interview I made it quite clear that it was my intention to raise funds for the Party in Bombay later on and that when I did so I expected not only the Tatas but all public spirited businessmen to contribute handsomely. After the Ahmedabad meeting of the All-India Congress Committee I went down to Bombay with the declared object of raising funds. Both at Ahmedabad and at Bombay I freely and openly asked all and sundry to subscribe to the Party fund, after fully explaining the commercial policy and programme of the Party including its attitude towards the excise duty on cotton for the removal of which the Congress had been agitating for years past long before the Swarajya Party came into existence. I made good progress all round except with one astute merchant in a large way of business and with little else to care for. This gentleman after receiving an assurance from me that my Party was in any event pledged to the removal of excise duty on cotton whether he helped it or not frankly told me that no business man would be such a fool as to pay a price for what he was going to get for nothing. Whilst in the midst of my work I was suddenly called away for a few days. On return to Bombay later I found that some disappointed politicians on the unemployed list had taken advantage of my temporary absence to go round the various business offices and bazars and dissuade people from subscribing. These prowlers in the dark promptly sought the safety of their lairs when I reappeared on the scene. But slander has the largest credit in every market and did its work with a few extra-nervous people. A good many however including those who are not at all interested in excise duty made a handsome response to my call and here I am safe home with the money in my pocket. Neither you nor any of the disgruntled politicians can reduce my collections by a farthing.

These are the facts and I call upon you to publish them as they are and remove the misapprehension you have caused by your editorial note. If there

58. To M R. Jayakar<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan  
Allahabad  
8th August 1924

My dear Jayakar,

Your letter enclosing copy of the letter of one Mr. Shah and of your reply was received after I had despatched my letter yesterday. I have since seen the same correspondence published in the *Chronicle*. It ought to satisfy all reasonable critics but there is at present a deplorable lack of reason in the political circles of Bombay and specially the class led by Patel. I have already given you my opinion as to how the latter should be dealt with. I see no other way to deal with him. As regards the general public I hope you will take early steps to evolve an equitable adjustment of the rights of land-lords and tenants and take the wind out of the sails of the Committee appointed at the public meeting with no less a personage than Mr. Patel as Chairman.

I am glad you are meeting me in Calcutta a day in advance of the meeting. I do not think we need trouble Lalji to go to Calcutta as I am afraid he is not likely to be very favourably impressed with our proceedings. But if you should think he is expecting an invitation and will feel slighted if not invited please wire to me and I shall both write and wire a pressing invitation.

Joseph is a good writer but has too long allowed himself to be used as a hireling to inspire any confidence. As for the Directorate of the *Chronicle* I have already told you what I have done. You must remember that whatever control we are getting of the paper has cost us practically nothing, and we must not be too exacting. However we shall talk about it when we meet in Calcutta.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

M.R. Jayakar, Esqr.  
391, Thakurdwar  
Bombay.

59. To Editor, *Times of India*<sup>2</sup>

To the Editor of the *Times of India*<sup>3</sup>

Sir,—My attention has been drawn to a particularly mean and malicious personal attack on me published in your issue of the 7th August under the

<sup>1</sup>M R. Jayakar Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Purshotamdas Thakurdas Papers.

<sup>3</sup>The *Times of India* was started in 1861 from Bombay after Robert Knight brought about the merger of the *Bombay Times*, the *Standard* and the *Telegraph*.

Swarajists believe that they have the support of the country in their council policy and programme but that if that is not so in fact it is their duty to bring the country round to their view. This means pro-council propaganda. In one sense the propaganda is being carried on by the Press from day to day by the publication of Council reports and criticisms thereon and for all practical purposes this would be enough *provided* no counter propaganda is started in any form or shape in the country. If such counter propaganda is started the Swarajists feel that they must justify their policy and programme wherever and whenever it is questioned. The one thing necessary to secure a peaceful atmosphere is therefore the complete avoidance of this conflict. It is not clear from your letter how this is to be achieved.

As far as I can see the Swarajists have no desire to capture the Congress machinery for any purpose other than a justification of their council policy. They expect sooner or later to obtain a verdict of the Congress in their favour and thus give a *quietus* to the controversy. The mere handing over of the machinery by one party to the other by agreement without any such verdict and the starting of a separate organization outside the Congress without some arrangement to avoid the conflict can hardly secure the peaceful atmosphere that you are striving for. But if it is the intention to make some arrangement to avoid such conflict before starting a separate organization why can it not be made within the existing organization? The question of the Executive being controlled by one party only can as I have already told you be easily settled if the actual Executive is reduced to its proper dimensions and no restrictions are placed on the membership of the larger deliberative bodies.

Again if you are going to have a separate organization confined to *Khad-dar*, H.M. unity, the removal of untouchability why not confine the Congress itself to these departments of work to the exclusion of every thing else and leave Congressmen to follow their own bent of mind in the matters so excluded without quarrelling with each other? We can join all parties on this limited programme without any distinction of pro-changer and no-changer. It seems to me that there is little else besides these three things that the Congress can do in the present circumstances and if you start a separate organization for these the Congress will automatically cease to function. What will the Swarajists run the Congress for? Surely not for the Councils alone?

I should like to have your considered opinion on the suggestion that at the next Congress we agree to narrow down the programme to the specific items you are anxious to work and postpone the consideration of the rest of the programme *sine die* for some future Congress without any expression of opinion.

The second point depends upon the first. If you are going to start a separate organization your presiding at the Congress will in effect be for the purpose of saying goodbye to it. But if some thing in the nature of what I have suggested can be settled there can be no more suitable President than yourself to give the word of command to stop all dissensions and work wholeheartedly on the three great needs of the country. If however the Congress *Pandal* is to be converted into a battlefield for pro-changers and no-changers I cannot at present think what to say.

I have given you the above ideas as they have occurred to me. They are

is any one who dares to question the absolute accuracy of these facts let him come out in the open and do so at his own risk.

I leave it to you to say whether the type of polemics which you and other English editors have recently started in India is consistent with the best traditions of journalism. Can you show me a single instance in any civilised country where a section of the Press in attacking the policy and programme of a political party with whose views it does not agree has resorted to the device of inducing the public by veiled threats to withhold financial appeal from the bete noire of that particular section of the press? Again it is common enough for opposing parties to abuse and vilify each other but what is one to think of a political party which without expecting or asking any support for itself makes it its sole business to go from door to door begging and beseeching the likely donors not to help its opponents?

Your note begins with a parable and ends in billingsgate. The parable can as easily apply to newspaper propaganda as to party propaganda—and thereby hangs a tale which will be told on a future occasion if necessary. Suffice it to say at present that the editorial pen is a much more effective instrument than the long stick with a wisp of grass tied at the end for the purpose referred to in the editorial note. The billingsgate hardly deserves any notice. If I appeared to you at times "a boisterous good fellow" let me tell you that Mr. C.R. Das is a jolly good fellow and so says all India with the exception of a few who have thrown in their lot with the bureaucracy to sink or swim with it.

Motilal Nehru

Allahabad, August 10.

60. To Mahatma Gandhi<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawn,  
Allahabad.

12.8.24

Dear Mahatmaji,

I received your very important letter of the 9th almost immediately after I posted mine of yesterday.

You do not expect me to answer it at once and I am not attempting to do so. I shall take it with me to Calcutta day after tomorrow. Besides the Calcutta friends I expect to meet Messrs. Kelkar, S. Srinivas Iyengar and others. Mrs. Naidu has also promised to come in for a day on her way to Assam. We shall consider your letter together and let you know our opinion on your proposals. Meanwhile I should like to clear up a few points in order to be better able to grasp the situation.

The whole controversy at present ranges round the Councils. The

<sup>1</sup>Gandhi Papers.



Sen Gupta<sup>1</sup>, Moonje, V.J. Patel, M.R. Jayakar, A. Rangaswami Iyengar, M.V. Abhyankar,<sup>2</sup> D.V. Gokhale<sup>3</sup>, V. Ramadas<sup>4</sup>, T.A.K. Sherwani<sup>5</sup>, M. Asaf Ali and E. Raghavendra Rao.<sup>6</sup>

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and Mrs. Naidu were present and the latter gave us the benefit of the impressions she had formed at her last interview with you. Messrs. Kelkar and Srinivas Iyengar were unavoidably absent.

We could not meet after your second letter<sup>7</sup> was received but it was shown individually to most of those I have named. Some of them had then left.

I will not attempt to describe all that I have felt since your letters were received and would leave it for you to imagine. Speaking for all of us collectively I can assure you that the contents of those letters deeply moved every one of us and that the appeal contained in the last went straight to our hearts. We considered them with a deep sense of gratitude for your very generous offer to help us and tried our best to find a way which would on the one hand be acceptable to you and on the other hand secure to us the strength and freedom so necessary for the success of our programme. I need hardly say that an unseemly scramble for power is as distasteful to us as it is to you and that we would gladly give up anything short of our principles to ensure the peaceful atmosphere without which it is impossible for either party to work on its own lines. With all these considerations before us we have after a most ear-

<sup>1</sup>Jatindra Mohan Sen-Gupta; b. 1885; Bar-at-law; joined the non-cooperation movement, 1921; led railway and labour strikes, 1921 and arrested; Chairman, Reception Committee, Bengal Provincial Conference, 1922; member, Congress Working Committee, 1922-23, Bengal Legislative Council, 1923-30; after the death of C.R. Das in 1925 became President of Bengal P.C.C. and leader of the Swaraj Party in the Council, Mayor of Calcutta, the position he occupied many times subsequently; Chairman, Reception Committee, Calcutta Congress session, 1928; President, Kerala Provincial Conference, 1931; suffered imprisonment several times; one of the promoters of *Forward*, and started *Advance*, an English daily; died in internment at Ranchi, 1933.

<sup>2</sup>M.V. Abhyankar; b. 1886; Bar-at-law; a close associate of Lokamanya Tilak in Nagpur; participated in the Home Rule movement; attended Amritsar Congress session, 1919; joined the Hindu Mahasabha in 1922; member, Swaraj Party; led anti-Simon Commission agitation; participated in the civil disobedience movement; member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1934, d. 1935.

<sup>3</sup>D.V. Gokhale, b. 1885; a follower of Tilak; Joint Secretary, Tilak's Home Rule League, 1916; participated in the non-cooperation and civil disobedience movements; member, Poona Municipality, 1922-29, 1932-35, Editor, *Mahratta*, 1918-30, *Kesari* 1931-46; Treasurer, Maharashtra Congress Committee; member, A.I.C.C., 1931-32; d. 1962.

<sup>4</sup>V. Ramadas Pantulu, b. 1873, one of the founders of the political, social and literary movements in Krishna district, Andhra Pradesh; practised at the District Court, Masulipatnam, 1899-1911, later at the Madras High Court; edited *Krishna Patrika*, 1907-08; elected to the Council of State in February 1925 and again in November 1926, leader of the Swaraj Party in the Council of State, 1926, resigned in 1930; member, A.I.C.C.; d. 1944.

<sup>5</sup>Tasadduq Ahmad Khan Sherwani; b. 1885, Bar-at-law; practised at Aligarh; member, A.I.C.C., 1919; arrested during the non-cooperation movement, 1921; moved to Allahabad in 1924 at the instance of Jawaharlal Nehru and started practice at the High Court; President, U.P. P.C.C., 1930, member, Congress Working Committee, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1926-30, re-elected to the Assembly in 1934; d. 1935.

<sup>6</sup>E. Raghavendra Rao; b. 1889; Bar-at-law; President, C.P. P. C.C., 1921; member, C.P. and Berar Legislative Council, 1923-30; Minister, C.P. and Berar, 1927-28; Home Minister, 1930, Acting Governor, C.P. and Berar, 1936; elected to the C.P. and Berar Legislative Assembly in 1937; Premier, C.P. and Berar, April-July 1937; Adviser to the Secretary of State for India, 1939, member, Viceroy's Executive Council, 1941; d. 1942.

not intended as a reply from the Swarajya Party to your proposal. This as I have already said will follow from Calcutta. It will greatly help us in coming to a right decision if you will throw some further light on the points I have mentioned.

Kindly address your reply to 148 Russa Road (Mr. Das's residence).

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

61. Telegram to Mahatma Gandhi<sup>1</sup>

Calcutta  
19.8.24

Mahatma Gandhi care Doctor Ansari  
Daryaganj Delhi

Absolutely necessary seeing you before you return Bombay wire exact date leaving Delhi.

Nehru

62. To Mahatma Gandhi<sup>2</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
25th August 1924

Dear Mahatmaji,

The engagements previously made in Calcutta and Jamshedpur made it impossible for me to meet you in Delhi before the 22nd when you were to leave for Ahmedabad. I returned to Allahabad yesterday only to proceed to Simla day after tomorrow. The earliest opportunity of seeing you that I can hope for will perhaps come about the end of September or the beginning of October. I have therefore to content myself with writing much as I and the friends who met in Calcutta would have preferred a personal talk between you and me on the subject of your letters of the 9th and the 15th August.

The first letter was very carefully considered in conference with several friends among whom may be mentioned Messrs. C.R. Das, Hasrat Mohani<sup>3</sup>,

<sup>1</sup>*Gandhi Papers.*

<sup>2</sup>*M.R. Jayakar Papers.*

<sup>3</sup>Maulana Hasrat Mohani; b. 1878, Urdu poet, politician; joined the Congress in 1903, President, Khilafat Workers' Conference, Delhi, 1920; moved resolution on complete independence at the Ahmedabad Congress session, 1921; Chairman, Reception Committee, Indian Communist Conference, Kanpur, 1925, participated in the civil disobedience movement; member, U.P. Muslim League Parliamentary Board, 1937; elected to the U.P. Legislative Assembly in 1946 and then to the Constituent Assembly; resigned from the Muslim League in 1947 and preferred to remain in India after partition; d. 1951.

those qualified to enter those committees and also for the election of delegates to the Congress. You are disqualifying them for the Committees and leaving them to take their chance at the election of delegates to the Congress with no voice in the subjects committee of that Congress. What will happen has been illustrated in the case of Mr. M.R. Jayakar, whom Bombay refused to elect even as a delegate. I leave it to you to say whether this is anything other than weakening the Swarajists which it is your purpose to do. As for embarrassing them you cannot help doing so by walking out of the Congress in the manner you suggest. I for one will be no party to an agreement which is based on your retirement from the Congress as a condition precedent—not because I have the least doubt in my own mind of being fully able to run it with my colleagues throughout the country according to our own lights but because the fact of stipulating for your retirement goes against my very soul quite apart from the public odium involved in it. I have the misfortune to differ from you and am prepared to take the consequence at the hands of the country in the usual way but not by taking from you an agreement disabling yourself. My whole spirit revolts against such an understanding. You are of course your own master and can take what step you think proper but it shall not be at our request if it imposes the least disability or restraint on you.

I hope you will reconsider the whole matter with special reference to what I have said and let me have your answer at Simla (Longwood Hotel).

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

63. To F.E. Dinshaw<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
26th August 1924

Dear Mr. Dinshaw,

Thanks for the remittances made from time to time after I left Bombay. I give overleaf a detail of the contributions<sup>2</sup> received from you up to date. Please check and confirm it. You will observe that the total sum received is less than half of the instalment promised within ten days after I left Bombay. This is probably due to the fact that most of your friends were out on business or holiday during this period. I hope the balance will be soon forthcoming as I have already made commitments requiring the full amount and more. As you know this is the time to organize the whole country which means a very considerable outlay for initial expenses. You will be glad to hear that I have now completed my arrangements in almost all the Provinces of India. The funds put at their disposal are however insufficient to carry out the full programme and will not last long. I know it is very hard on you to expect you to find time from your numerous pre-occupations to go round to the

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers.

<sup>2</sup>See Appendix III, 4.

nest and anxious consideration of the situation come to the conclusion that the only effective way to avoid all conflict and unpleasantness is to confine the Congress to the three main heads of work you wish to concentrate upon viz., Hindu-Muslim Unity, removal of untouchability and *Khaddar*. If this central idea is accepted the following changes in the Congress constitution will we trust meet all the requirements of the case.

1. A clear line of demarcation to be drawn between the purely executive and the purely deliberative parts of the central and subordinate Congress organisations from top to bottom in all Provinces except Bengal; such Executive to be run exclusively by no-changers under your guidance up to the end of 1925, regardless of the majority or minority view. The deliberative part to remain open to all by election as now but Swarajists not to interfere with or take part in the actual working of the executive except when invited to do so. In other words the Working Committee of the All India Congress Committee and the Executive Committees of the various Provincial, District and Tehsil Committees (except in Bengal) with such additions and changes in their personnel as you may think proper to be the pure executives to be exclusively manned by no-changers under your direction, and the All India Congress Committee and the Provincial, District and Tehsil Committees with such alterations in their constitution as may be necessary to form the deliberative part of the machinery open to all by election.

*Exception.* In Bengal a *Khaddar* department to be specially formed by you to work under your direction but the executive for the general purposes to be responsible to Provincial and subordinate committees.

2. The question of Council entry not to be raised at the Belgaum Congress and no anti-Council propaganda to be carried on by no-changers from now up to the end of 1925.

3. Each party to work in its own sphere of action without obstructing or interfering with the other

4. Swarajists to render all help and co-operation to the Congress Executive in carrying out the programme settled as above.

5. All idea of either party working for a majority in order to capture the Congress of 1924 or that of 1925 to be definitely given up by issuing strict instructions in that behalf and the country to be left free to form its independent judgment on the merits of the work of both parties at the end of 1925.

6. Mahatma Gandhi to preside at the Belgaum Congress and lay down the revised programme for the whole country.

The above scheme in our opinion satisfies one of the two alternatives you have mentioned in your letter of the 15th, viz., Swarajists not acting upon the Congress and you not getting mixed up with the Council programme. The other alternative viz., the Swarajists manning the Congress and you relegating yourself to the position you occupied in 1915-18 is not pleasant to contemplate. If your idea of Swarajists not acting upon the Congress means that they should go out of all Congress organisations executive and deliberative as at present constituted, i.e., the All India Congress Committee and all Provincial District and Tehsil Committees as they are now it really comes to depriving the Swarajists of all footing in the Congress. Congressmen outside these committees have only one function to perform and that is to vote once a year for

65. Telegram to Editors<sup>1</sup>

Bombay Chronicle  
Hindu,<sup>2</sup> Swarajya<sup>3</sup>  
Voice of India

Send my issue of your paper to Longwood Hotel Simla till further notice.

Motilal Nehru  
28.8.24

66. Telegram to Rafi Ahmad Kidwai<sup>4</sup>

Rafi Ahmad  
Anand Bhawan Allahabad

Gaurishankar reported suffering typhoid arrange his treatment and continuation of party work.

Nehru  
Simla. 1.9.24

67. Telegram to Maulvi Shafee<sup>5</sup>

Maulvi Shafee<sup>6</sup>  
Care Congress Bhagalpur

Your letter wire present situation Deep<sup>7</sup> thinks his presence will have no

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers.

<sup>2</sup>The Hindu was started as a weekly in 1878 by G. Subramania Iyer and M. Viraraghavachari. It became a tri-weekly in 1883 and a daily in 1889. G. Subramania Iyer was its first editor.

<sup>3</sup>The Swarajya was started by T. Prakasam in 1921 and achieved great popularity but failed to stabilise its position. It was closed down after 12 years for financial reasons.

<sup>4</sup>AICC Papers.

<sup>5</sup>AICC Papers.

<sup>6</sup>Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi, b. 1863; Secretary, Bihar Khilafat Committee; President, Bihar P.C.C., 1921; Secretary, District Congress Committee, Muzaffarpur, 1921; Vice-Chairman, Darbhanga District Board, 1923; member, Swaraj Party; Vice-President, Bihar P.C.C., 1924; member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1923-29, re-elected in 1934; formed the Ahrar Party in 1937; d. 1949.

<sup>7</sup>Deep Narayan Singh; b. 1875 at Bhagalpur; Bar-at-law; President, Bengal Provincial Conference, 1901 and 1907; participated in the swadeshi movement, 1905, Secretary, Bihar P.C.C., 1909; member, A.I.C.C.; elected to the Bengal Legislative Council in 1910; toured extensively around the world; joined the non-cooperation movement in 1920, Chairman, Bhagalpur Municipality, 1922; President, Bihar P.C.C., 1928, participated in salt satyagraha, 1930 and imprisoned for four months; elected to the Indian Legislative Assembly in 1934; d. 1935.

various offices but I hope that having put your hand to the business you will see it through.

I have not heard from you about the *Chronicle*. To-day's paper's report further decrees for Rs 8000/- and Rs 5000/- having been passed by Bombay High Court. These with costs and interest would probably mount up to something like 25 to 30 thousand rupees. I wonder if the original sum proposed to be raised by the issue of debentures will suffice for all the immediate requirements of the *Chronicle* including the paying off of the first debenture holders. All I know is that the policy of the paper is shaping fairly well though it is by no means quite up to the mark yet. It is well worth arranging for additional debentures for an extra few thousand rupees to keep the control of the paper in our own hands. The condition precedent for this is of course our having a majority on the directorate. I have not yet heard from the Sobani Brothers about the appointment of the new director agreed upon. Mr. Lalji Naranji has accepted my offer with considerable hesitation relying on my assurance that you would find another businessman who would look to the management side. I hope you have selected some one to join us on the Board of Directors.

I am leaving for Simla on the 28th. My address will be "Longwood Hotel".

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

F.E. Dinshaw Esqr.,  
Pawai Road,  
Bombay.

64 To Mahatma Gandhi<sup>1</sup>

Punjab Mail  
28.8.24

Dear Mahatmaji

By a strange miscalculation of dates I sent the original of this to Bombay (Laburnum Road) by the Bombay Mail leaving Allahabad on the morning of the 26th. Jawahar who came to the station to see me off said that a letter even if posted today would reach you before you leave Ahmedabad. I am therefore posting this copy in the train. I am on my way to Simla.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

<sup>1</sup>Gandhi Papers.

you have readily believed. I am aware that you have publicly avowed your distrust of Swarajists but I think you will admit that they have some sort of a code of honour to go by. Even thieves are supposed to have one. But whatever you may call us or think of us please do not for a moment entertain the idea that we are capable of accepting an offer influenced by pressure of the kind you were labouring under when you made it. I for one cannot bring myself to treat it as a free and voluntary offer proceeding from a reasoned belief in its fairness and based solely on the exigencies of the situation which has called for it. If after an enquiry from Jawahar or any other person you may consider necessary you are able completely to disabuse your mind of the effect produced by the falsehoods you have been told and then repeat the offer I shall be glad to express my own opinion thereon and consult Das and other friends. But if you continue to entertain the possibility of my being the vile creature capable of the conduct ascribed to me I must in all humility decline to treat with you. In the latter case the offer may be taken to have never been made. I shall make no use of it however acceptable it may be to me and to my party.

Mahatmaji, believe me when I say that no lies in the world will affect the love and esteem I have for you and that nothing can come between me and my Jawahar. You are by common consent the greatest Indian living and let me prophesy that Jawahar who to the thoughtless may appear to be only a blind follower of yours is destined to be even greater if he is only spared to the country for the natural span of human life. This may be a highly exaggerated expectation of a fond father but there it is. I have lived for him till I was of any use to him. I now live in him and hope to continue to do so to the end of my days and after. But neither you nor Jawahar can deprive me of the little spark of reason that has fallen to my lot. That little spark will continue to guide me. For that little spark I shall if need be fight you and him and the rest of the world to the death.

Mahatmaji, you have placed yourself under evil influences. They are pulling you down from the high place which is yours and yours alone. Beware of your friends.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

I am sending copies of your letter, my telegram, and this letter to Jawahar without any further comment. I am not writing to Das or any other friend for the present. Except for a friend who happened to be present when our letter was received and to whom I thoughtlessly showed it and another friend to whom I equally thoughtlessly mentioned it no other person has seen it. These two friends will also see this reply but no others.

decisive effect but will start if urgently required don't call him if you can possibly manage yourselves.

Nehru  
Simla, 2.9.24

68. To Mahatma Gandhi<sup>1</sup>

Longwood Hotel  
Simla  
2.9.24

Dear Mahatmaji,

Your letter of the 30th August received yesterday was most painful reading. With all our differences of opinion I could not have imagined that I had gone down so low in your estimation as to make you believe that the fiendish conduct attributed to me was even a "possibility" as you call it. Your letter has truly been an eye opener to me. I can now see clearly what I have been suspecting all along viz. that you are being systematically duped by unscrupulous liars who have ingratiated themselves into your favour by the simple device of pretending an abiding faith in *Khaddar* to the exclusion of all else. I received your letter as I was starting for a committee meeting and all I could do at the moment was to scribble a long telegram to you giving the bare facts.

I have since read and re-read your letter and have slept over it for such odd moments as the train of thought it set in motion allowed me to. I have also reconsidered the telegram<sup>2</sup> I sent you yesterday. I feel I have nothing to add to it. Indeed after full consideration of the matter I think I went out of my way to give you the facts. I should simply have referred you to Jawahar to find them out for yourself. He at least is the one person in the family who we are all agreed is incapable of telling a lie. As however my telegram gives practically all the facts bearing on the question of Indu's going to school I may add another wholly unconnected with the incident but in all probability taken as a foundation to construct the malicious lie. I have often remarked in the family circle and outside it to some friends—but never in the presence of Jawahar so far as I recollect, it being my constant care to avoid hurting his feelings in any way—that the extreme attitude you were taking was quite likely to drive me and many others of my thinking to discard *Khaddar* despite the faith we have in it as one of the essentials for our progress. This would not be out of sheer cussedness but because I feared that *Khaddar* would inevitably come to be associated with some of your doctrines to which most of us do not subscribe. Except in this connection I have never dreamt of going against *Khaddar*.

I now come to the business part of your letter. It is clear that your offer of terms is to a very great extent due to the state of mind induced by the lies

<sup>1</sup>Motilal Nehru Papers.

<sup>2</sup>See next item.



71. Telegram to K.M. Panikkar<sup>1</sup>Panikkar<sup>2</sup>

Post Box 78, Delhi

Welcome *Hindustan Times*<sup>3</sup> as friend and ally Swarajya Party stop Hope we shall fight shoulder to shoulder against all odds to help motherland come into her own.

Nehru

Longwood Hotel Simla 9.9.24

72. Telegram to C.R. Das<sup>4</sup>

Chittaranjan Das

148 Russa Road

Bhawaniipur, Calcutta

Show Gandhi's letter excluding first part my letters being entirely personal should not be shown Wire when coming here.

Nehru

Longwood Hotel Simla 10.9.24

73. Telegram to C.R. Das<sup>5</sup>

Chittaranjan Das

148 Russa Road

Bhawaniipur, Calcutta

Mrs. Besant here proposes going Calcutta to see you after consultation with

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Kavalam Madhava Panikkar; b. 1894; Bar-at-law; taught at Aligarh, 1919-22; Joint Editor, *Swarajya*, July 1922-February 1924; Congress representative in Amritsar to report on the Akali agitation, 1924; Editor, *Hindustan Times*; Adviser in Kashmir, 1928; Secretary, Indian States delegation to Round Table Conference, 1930; Secretary to Chancellor, Chamber of Princes, 1931; Political and Education Minister, Patiala State, 1933-39; Dewan, Bikaner State, 1939, attended the Pacific Relations Conference, 1942 and Commonwealth Relations Conference, 1945; member, Indian delegation to U.N. General Assembly, 1947; Indian Ambassador to China, 1948-52, Egypt, 1952-53, France, 1956-59; Vice-Chancellor, Jammu and Kashmir University, 1961; d. 1963.

<sup>3</sup>The *Hindustan Times* was started in 1924 by the Akalis with K.M. Panikkar as editor. Later on it was taken over by Madan Mohan Malaviya and Lala Lajpat Rai, and in 1927 by G.D. Birla who became its director.

<sup>4</sup>AICC Papers.<sup>5</sup>AICC Papers.

69. *Telegram to Mahatma Gandhi*<sup>1</sup>

2 September 1924

Mahatma Gandhi  
 Sabarmati Ashram

Your letter story about Jawahar is an issue of lies from beginning to end stop. Did not insist on Indu going to school but merely expressed wish which Jawahar dutifully obeyed stop school wholly unconnected with govt. Jawahar's objection being based on unsuitability of instruction imparted stop was solely prompted by desire give Indu companionship of children of her age regardless of instruction and Jawahar eventually agreed stop other things reported to you absolutely false too devilish and mean for proudest father in world to contemplate writing.

Nehru

70. *Telegram to Mohanlal Saksena*<sup>2</sup>

Mohanlal Saksena<sup>3</sup>  
 Din Dayal Road Lucknow

Follow lines of my resolution in Assembly on Lee Commission<sup>4</sup> with necessary modification suiting Provincial requirements.

Nehru  
 Longwood Hotel 8.9.24

<sup>1</sup>*Gandhi Papers.*<sup>2</sup>*AICC Papers.*

<sup>3</sup>Mohanlal Saksena; b. 1896, participated in the non-cooperation movement; member and Chief Whip of Swaraj Party, U.P. Legislative Council, 1924-26; General Secretary, U.P. P.C.C., 1928-35, Minister for Rehabilitation, Government of India, 1948-50, member, Provisional Parliament, 1950-52, Lok Sabha, 1952-57, Rajya Sabha, 1959-64, d. 1965.

<sup>4</sup>This Commission was appointed under the chairmanship of Lord Lee of Fareham in 1923 to consider the racial composition of the superior Indian public services of the Government of India. It proposed in 1924 that 40 per cent of future entrants should be British, 40 per cent Indians directly recruited and 20 per cent Indians promoted from the provincial service.

here till tenth Address Kutab Dak Bungalow.

Nehru  
Delhi 3.10.24

77. *Telegram to Editor, The Statesman*<sup>1</sup>

Statesman<sup>2</sup> Calcutta

Eighth October is day of thanksgiving and rejoicing thanksgiving for successful termination of penance imposed upon himself by India's greatest son to rid her of incubus of internal dissensions rejoicing for foundation laid in his sufferings of united India Let us raise on that foundation the noble edifice of equality and fraternity for all communities.

Motilal Nehru

78. *To Purshotamdas Thakurdas*<sup>3</sup>

Kutab Dak Bungalow  
Delhi  
8.10.1924

My dear Sir P,

I hope you are enjoying the delights of home surroundings after your labours in Simla. As you know I have not been so fortunate. When leaving Simla I little suspected that there was more difficult work awaiting me at Delhi. They jockeyed me into the chair of the "Unity Conference" in spite of my loud protests. What was specially annoying to me was the fact that those who were most insistent appeared to me to be so in the hope that I would make a dismal failure and they would have a chance to have a fling at me. Under the best of conditions it would be a hopeless job to try to bring together the warring elements I had to deal with but it was more specially so during the present high tension between the various communities. For seven continuous days and nights I worked in what promised to be a pandemonium. More than a dozen times it came to the breaking point but I am thankful to say that I was successful every time in averting the disaster by using a mixture of persuasion, cajolery and sternness varying the proportion of these ingredients from time to time to suit the occasion and the temperament of the house. It will of course be idle to claim that the "Unity Conference" has established

<sup>1</sup> *AICC Papers*

<sup>2</sup> *The Statesman* was an English daily started in Calcutta by Robert Knight in 1875 with the help of Calcutta merchants and Trilockya Nath Chatterji, the Manager of the Patkpara Raj Estate. Eventually it was merged with the *Friend of India* in 1877.

<sup>3</sup> *Purshotamdas Thakurdas Papers*.

me stop Hindu Mohamadan question raised here acute form stop Gandhi proposals require early disposal stop Early meeting Executive Committee essential five members including Hasrat Mohani already here stop Arrange coming earliest possible date Wire.

Nehru  
Simla 12.9.24

74. *Telegram<sup>1</sup>*

Devaki Prasad<sup>2</sup> left Simla without informing me is reported having sailed for England.

Motilal Nehru  
Longwood Hotel 17.9.24

75. *Telegram to Maulana Abdul Bari<sup>3</sup>*

Maulana Abdul Bari  
Lucknow

Your telegrams already replied to by Mohamad Ali resolution does not refer to past historical events or persons.

Motilal Nehru  
3.10.1924

76. *Telegram to Mrs. Jinnah<sup>4</sup>*

Mrs. Jinnah<sup>5</sup>  
Hotel Cecil Simla

Letter just received You are quite right about my preference stop Staying

<sup>1</sup>*AICC Papers*, Telegram to Mathura Prasad Sinha, Father of Devaki Prasad Sinha.

<sup>2</sup>Devaki Prasad Sinha; b. 1890; lawyer; took satyagraha pledge in 1919, was in touch with M.N. Roy who hoped to utilise him in the formation of the Communist Party in India; member, Bihar Legislative Council, 1920-23, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1923-26; joined the Independent Congress Party; member, Bihar Legislative Council, 1926-1930; Senior Defence Counsel, Meerut Conspiracy Case and Gaya Conspiracy Case; d. 1946.

<sup>3</sup>*AICC Papers*.

<sup>4</sup>*AICC Papers*.

<sup>5</sup>Ruttenbai Jinnah; b. 1900; daughter of Sir Dinshaw M. Petit; married M.A. Jinnah, 1918, d. 1929.

79. To N.C. Kelkar<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
18.10.24

Dear Kelkar,

After Mahatmaji broke his fast there were a number of consultations with him on the questions of:—

1. The status of the Swarajya Party in the Congress.
2. The nature of the Franchise.

Mr. Das took part in the first consultation, but was unfortunately taken ill thereafter and I alone represented the Swarajya Party at the subsequent consultations. The drafts proposed on behalf of the party were however agreed upon between Mr. Das and myself before they were shown to or discussed with Mahatmaji. Copies of the various drafts are herewith enclosed.<sup>2</sup>

Drafts marked (a) and (b) were first prepared by us as a result of the first conversation with Mahatmaji at which he gave us the impression that the idea of the Swarajya Party acting as the agents of the Congress in all political activities was acceptable to him. The two drafts (a) and (b) were shown to him as alternative proposals. He did not agree with (a) but agreeing in the principle of (b) took time to consider the language. The next day he produced draft (c) over which Mr. Das and I had a hurried consultation as Mr. Das was leaving for Simla. I prepared draft (d) the next day and the result of discussion I had with Mahatmaji therein is shown in (e).

As the franchise (f) represents the proposal I made to Mahatmaji and (g) his counter proposal. It will be seen that the important words "when disabled from any cause" are omitted in my draft, while the position they occupy in Mahatmaji's draft leaves it doubtful whether they apply only "to member of the family" or also to "any other person". This was subsequently made clear to me [by] Mahatmaji who insisted that vicarious spinning whether through a member of the family or an outsider would be permissible only in case a member was disabled from spinning himself. I told him plainly that there was little chance of such a franchise being acceptable to my party or for the matter of that to the general public and after some further discussion I informed Mahatmaji that I could only treat (e) and (g) as proposals emanating from him and lay them for consideration before a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Swarajya Party which Mr. Das and I had agreed to call about the end of this month at Allahabad. On this he expressed his desire that the meeting might be held at Delhi on the 28th October so that he might have an opportunity of explaining his point of view to the members. I readily agreed to this and wrote at once to Mr. Das to intimate acceptance of the date and the place by wire. I am expecting his reply in the course of the day.

I am addressing this letter to all the members of the Ex. Council with a view to post them in what has so far happened and also to impress upon them the importance of the meeting to be held in Delhi. I have marked

<sup>1</sup>M.S. Aney Papers.

<sup>2</sup>See Appendix III, 5.

any real unity. The sole business of the Conference was to lay a foundation for tolerance during Mahatmaji's fast and prepare the ground generally for him. The ultimate success or failure lies with him & his will be the credit or blame for it. We know he will follow his own methods and to be perfectly frank with you I have very serious doubts about the success of these methods. However I am glad I am out of it as gracefully as could be expected and am not at all sorry for the disappointment of those who calculated on my failure.

The long fast ends today. Mahatmaji has gone through it most admirably. It was only yesterday that he showed any signs of exhaustion and that in my opinion was due to the approach of the end of the fast—the strong will which sustained him throughout having done its part so wonderfully was slackening its support. We are about to leave Kutab to be present at the ceremony of breaking the fast which is to come off at noon today. After this there will be a few days waiting for the return of normal strength and then will come the fateful discussion of the political situation which to a hard matter of fact man like myself remains unaffected by the long fast.

Mr. & Mrs. Das are with me at Kutab. The climate is all that can be desired this time of the year. We have made up our minds to prolong our stay for another week and settle the whole programme before we part. It seems to be more than apparent that the whole brunt of real political work in the country will fall on us. Gandhiji will either convert the Congress into a spinners association or else stick to his five boycotts. Neither will suit us or the country. The inevitable result will be that we shall have to organise work on our own lines. In this connection may I remind you that the full amount promised "within 10 days" in July last has not reached me and that if it comes to our having a different programme to Gandhiji's, as I am afraid it will, we shall require the second instalment promised by the middle of Novr. as early as possible. I shall write to you before I leave and tell you all that happens here.

Mr. Das has sent his jute scheme to Mr. Lalji Naranji. It is a grand idea. I think half of our Swaraj lies in the Bengal jute. To a keen businessman like you it is unnecessary to say why. Please examine the scheme critically and make your suggestions. It cannot possibly succeed without you and other Bombay friends putting the shoulder to the wheel. The hour is struck and we must attack this citadel of the enemy. Please let me hear from you about the scheme at an early date.

I hope our friend R.D.'s affairs are looking up and that your kind offices at Simla are bearing fruit.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely  
(Motilal Nehru)

*Correspondence*

or stronger allies in the political sphere than the Swarajists.

I have written a long confidential letter to F.E. As you are within the circle of confidence I enclose a copy to save you the trouble of getting the original from F.E. I hope you will add your weight to what I have said in that letter.

It is not given to me to spend even a few days in the quiet and peace of home and I am leaving for Nagpur tomorrow night at the request of Gandhiji to settle the Hindu-Mohammadan disputes there. I hope to be back by the 24th.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

Enclosure:  
One letter.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas,  
111, Esplanade Road,  
Fort, Bombay

*Enclosure*

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
18.10 1924

Dear Mr. Dinshaw,

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas met me at the Delhi station night before last and was complaining that I had not written to you for a very long time. I have all along been under the impression that at least two of my letters to you had remained unacknowledged. I have an office copy of one dated the 26th August last which I enclose. The other was written from Simla in my own hand and I have no copy. Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas was confident that you did not receive any of these letters as you would be sure to reply if you did. I thought you had overlooked them among your numerous pre-occupations but must now share the belief of Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas. The copy enclosed will speak for itself. I am sorry I cannot reproduce the contents of the letter I wrote from Simla as I did so at a time when I was being dreadfully rushed by the manifold calls upon me.

A complete memo of the remittances received from you up to the date of writing the letter copy of which is enclosed is attached to that letter. After that date my Pass Book shows the receipt of two remittances from Bombay: one of ten thousand received from you on the 28th August and other of twenty-five thousand received from Mr. Lalji Naranji. These bring up the total to Rs. 97,500/-excluding your donation of five thousand or Rs. 1,02,500/-including it. Strictly speaking the twenty-five thousand (Lalji Naranji's) and five thousand (Yours) should not be taken into the account of Rs. 1,37,500/-the amount settled as the first instalment of the contributions from Bombay

this letter and the enclosures as "strictly confidential not for publication" and I trust they will be treated as such and not published either fully or in substance. They mark only a stage in the negotiation and if the contents are made public prematurely the No-change party would make strenuous efforts to prevent Mahatmaji from extending any recognition to the Swarajya Party. It will be seen that Mahatmaji's draft upon that point is an improvement on all our drafts and was made by him with the sole desire to induce us to agree to the franchise. I may in the strictest confidence tell you that he is prepared to go to any length in modifying or even abandoning his peculiar notions of non-cooperation if only he could make everybody spin and as to latter I think we can make him agree to relax the rule as regards the quantity to be spun being reduced to a minimum if we are prepared to show that we do not object to spinning in principle. Indeed he was quite pleased at my offer to spin for a few odd minutes now and then without binding myself to the quantity.

I shall wire to you the exact date and place of the meeting as soon as I hear from Mr. Das. Please make it a point to attend the meeting whatever the inconvenience involved in it.

Yours sincerely,  
-Motilal Nehru

80. To Purshotamdas Thakurdas<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
19.10.1924

Dear Sir Purshotamdas,

I received your letter of the 8th October on my return here.

I have carefully read the memorandum enclosed in your letter and have since seen the report of your viva voce examination reported in the press. While agreeing with you generally in the opinions expressed in your memorandum on dyarchy and the need of full responsibility in the Central and Provincial Governments I should have been glad to make a few suggestions in regard to your actual proposals if I had received your letter in time. It is needless now to go into that matter.

In your viva voce examination you have distinctly scored over your questioners and I heartily congratulate you on your success. What is specially gratifying to me is that you have practically identified yourself and through you the commercial interests of Bombay with the Swarajist's demand. It cannot now be said that the Swarajist's aims are incompatible with ordered development of Commerce and Industry and when your evidence is read with the last declaration of Commercial and Industrial policy made by the Swarajya Party in Calcutta there is little doubt left that Commerce cannot have better



to tell you but they can wait till I write next.

I got an intimation from the Bank this afternoon that you had paid Rs. 500/- into my private account. I do not understand what this is for. Kindly let me know.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

F.E. Dinshaw Esq.,  
Pawai Road,  
Bombay.

*81. Telegram for Leaders' Conference on Repression in Bengal<sup>1</sup>*

The Executive Committee of the Swaraj Party and other prominent Swarajists meet in Calcutta on the 4th; suggest Calcutta for the Conference you propose; if agreeable, can change date to suit convenience. Moulana Mohamed Ali is still of opinion that the conference should be held in Delhi and is in communication with other leaders.

(Motilal Nehru)

*82. Telegram to Mahatma Gandhi<sup>2</sup>*

2 Nov. 1924

To  
Mahatma Gandhi, Daryaganj  
Delhi

Mahadeo's<sup>3</sup> letter stop too late to post invitations after consulting you and Das stop suggest your wiring associations named by Mohamed Ali inviting representatives also prominent individuals on behalf yourself Das and me.

Motilal Nehru

<sup>1</sup>*The Hindustan Times*, 31 October 1924.

<sup>2</sup>*Gandhi Papers*.

<sup>3</sup>Mahadev Desai; b. 1892; Secretary to Mahatma Gandhi, 1917-42; participated in the civil disobedience, individual satyagraha and Quit India movements; died a prisoner in the Aga Khan Palace, Poona in 1942.

The notice is short but Mabatmaji expects a good gathering.

As I hope to have your *darshan* and give you mine within the next two days I shall not take up your time by writing on the several topics which await discussion. I shall probably spend a week in Bombay and will put up with R.D. Tata if he is in town. More when we meet.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

### 85. To the Elected Members<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
11th Nov. 1924

To

The Elected Members of the Legislative Councils, the Council of State and the Indian Legislative Assembly.

Dear Sir,

Efforts are being made everywhere in the country to close up the ranks of national workers, as it is becoming abundantly clear that there can be only two parties in India—the bureaucracy and their friends on the one hand and the people on the other. It is to be presumed that the bureaucracy have still a considerable number of supporters, but practically the whole of political India is engaged in combating their pretensions and freeing the country from their autocratic rule.

The methods pursued are different, but the difference between the parties, Swarajist—Independent or Liberal, are more superficial than real. This has been demonstrated by the working of the present Central and Provincial Legislatures during the last Session. Such differences of opinion as there were between nationalists of different shades of opinion did not come in the way of their putting forth their united strength in opposing the Government whenever the true interests of the country demanded it. The situation now created by the Government leaves no room for any differences to interfere with such joint action as may be determined upon and in view of the recent arrangement arrived at between Mahatma Gandhi and the Executive Council of the Swarajya Party in Calcutta it is desirable for all parties to revise their policy and programme and try to find a common ground.

The present system of Government admittedly needs overhauling. It is to the interest of the bureaucracy to have warring parties in India. It is our common interest—it is the paramount national interest—that all parties should come to an agreement.

The Executive Committee of the Swarajya Party has therefore authorised me to invite the Indian Elected Members of all the Legislatures in the country to a conference to be held in Bombay in continuation of the meetings of the

<sup>1</sup>Purshotomdas Thakurdas Papers.

83 Telegram to Murarilal Rohatgi<sup>1</sup>

Doctor Murarilal<sup>2</sup>  
Cawnpore

Impossible reaching Cawnpore Sunday stop prefer addressing meeting personally please fix any day after Tuesday giving ample notice in town and villages wire tomorrow date fixed.

Motilal Nehru  
148 Russa Road Calcutta 7.11.24

84 To Purshotamdas Thakurdas<sup>3</sup>

Allahabad.  
10.11.24

Dear Sir Purshotamdas,

Your letters of the 25th Octr. & the 5th Novr. have gone round and round with me till they at last caught me in Allahabad. They have both brought blushes to my withered cheeks. You are really too partial to me and make me feel that I have to be on my best behaviour at all hours of the day and night to keep my place in your estimation. I have no doubt that it is worth all the trouble I can take to do so. But the feeling that Sir P is looking on and expects me to do the right thing at every moment makes me a bit nervous and I am fast getting into the habit of calculating the chances of pleasing you before I commit myself to any definite opinion of action. My latest achievement the recent "Treaty of Calcutta" has not yet had your blessing and I am anxious to know what you think of it.

We must really put our heads together to deal with the new menace. I fought hard with Mahatmajji to have the series of meetings we decided upon in Calcutta called in Bombay & have succeeded. The 21st Novr. and the following days will give Bombay the proud distinction of giving birth to a united India. The decree was passed in Calcutta. It has only to be registered in Bombay but Bombay will have all the credit. There are to be the following meetings at one and the same time:

1. The All India Congress Committee.
2. The General Council of the Swaraj Party.
3. All the elected members of the Indian and Provincial Legislatures.
4. The All India Leaders not included in the first three categories.

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Dr. Murarilal Rohatgi, b. 1874, a leading doctor of Kanpur; resigned from Government service in 1906 and started private practice; Chairman, Reception Committee, Kanpur Congress session, 1925; member, U.P. Legislative Assembly, 1937-47, U.P. Legislative Council, 1947-51, Rajya Sabha, 1952-58; d. 1961.

<sup>3</sup>Purshotamdas Thakurdas Papers

this in mind when he said something to the following effect in the course of his speech:—

“The Swarajists have a perfect right to strengthen and organise themselves and to appeal to the country for support. They have a perfect right to ask not only the general public but also the No-Changers to join the Swaraj Party. The No-Changers have no right to object to any such appeal of the Swarajists and it is improper for them to oppose the Swarajist propaganda and dissuade people from joining the Party. The only answer the No-Changers can give is to engage themselves more zealously in working out the constructive programme.”

I cannot of course vouch for the words uttered by Mahatmaji but have no doubt of the general sense which they conveyed. Will you kindly examine the original report and try to find out how this omission came to be made? It was because of the remarks made by Mahatmaji that I refrained from contradicting Mr. Mohamed Ali publicly. The omission of Mahatmaji's remarks from the report of his speech now leaves his article in the *Comrade* uncontradicted and I cannot allow it to remain so. Please rectify the mistake by supplying the omission in some suitable way and let me have an answer at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely  
Motilal Nehru

Syed Abdullah Brelvi Esq.,  
Editor,  
*The Bombay Chronicle*,  
Bombay

88. To Lalji Naranji<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad,  
28th November 1924

Dear Mr. Lalji Naranji.

Many thanks for the remittance of Rs 5000/- on behalf of Mr. Narottam Morarji<sup>2</sup>. It was received on the morning I was leaving for Bombay and I could not acknowledge it earlier.

I am sorry I was suddenly called away from Bombay owing to the serious

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Narottam Morarjee; b. 1877, recognised as the father of modern Indian shipping; joined his father's firm, Messrs Morarjee Goculdas & Co.; Sheriff of Bombay, 1912; later was offered the C.I.E. for his services during the First World War but he declined the honour; came into close contact with Gandhiji; contributed for the establishment of Sabarmati Ashram, Ahmedabad; one of the Founder-Directors of Tata Iron and Steel Company; Founder-Chairman, Scindia Steam Navigation Company, 1919-29, member, Indian Fiscal Commission, 1921; d. 1929.

All India Congress Committee, the General Council of Swarajya Party and the All India Leaders beginning on the afternoon of the 21st November 1924 at 4 O' clock at Krishna Buildings, Fort, Bombay. Your presence at this conference is earnestly requested and it is hoped that you will make it a point to attend even at some inconvenience.

Kindly intimate your arrival and address in Bombay to the Provincial Secretary, Swarajya Party, Arya Bhawan, Sandhurst Road, Bombay.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

### 86 To Purshotamdas Thakurdas<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
14.11.1924

Dear Sir Purshotamdas,

This is to inform you that I shall arrive in Bombay in the afternoon of the 19th and will stay with Mr. R.D. Tata. I hope you will take part in the informal Conference to be held at Gandhiji's residence (Laburnum Road) the next morning. I should however like to see you before the Conference if you can look in at Tata's any time on Wednesday afternoon.

Yours sincerely  
Motilal Nehru

### 87. To S.A. Brelvi<sup>2</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad  
27.11.1924

My dear Brelvi,

In the dak edition of the *Chronicle* of the 25th instant I find what purports to be the full text of the opening speech delivered by Mahatmaji at the meeting of the All India Congress Committee. I notice in the report a very serious omission and do not know what to attribute it to.

You will remember that in the last issue of the *Comrade*<sup>3</sup> Mr. Mohamed Ali indulged in a very unfair criticism of my "appeal to the country on behalf of the Swaraj Party". I complained of this to Mahatmaji. Mahatmaji regretted the impropriety of the remarks made by Mr. Mohamed Ali. I believe he had

<sup>1</sup>Purshotamdas Thakurdas Papers.

<sup>2</sup>S.A. Brelvi Papers.

<sup>3</sup>*Comrade* was an English weekly started from Calcutta by Mohamed Ali in 1911. It was shifted to Delhi in 1912 and continued till the 1920s.

90. To W.B. Brett<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
29th November 1924

To  
W.B. Brett,<sup>2</sup> Esq. I.C.S.,  
Secretary, Indian Taxation Enquiry Committee,  
New Imperial Secretariat Buildings,  
Raisina,  
Delhi.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge your letter No. 76-T of the 10th November 1924 in the matter of the Indian Taxation Enquiry Committee.

I have read your letter and the enclosure very carefully and am surprised that the request for assistance should be made above all persons to members of the Legislative Assembly whose recommendations in regard to the nature and scope of the enquiry have been completely ignored and the very Committee which they resolved to dissolve by a majority of 60 to 42 has been forced upon the country.

For the present it is enough to refer you to the recent debate in the Assembly and to say that the Swaraj Party is not prepared to recognize or afford any assistance to a Committee the appointment of which is an affront to the Legislature and harmful to the country. In the opinion of the Party the enquiry is wholly misconceived and the personnel of the Committee entirely unsatisfactory.

I regret therefore that I am unable to comply with your request.

I have the honour to be,  
Sir,  
Your most obedient servant,  
(Motilal Nehru)

91. Press Notice<sup>3</sup>

Press Notice dated 29th Nov. asking names and addresses.

The proposers and seconders of names for the Committee appointed by the All Parties Conference held in Bombay omitted at the time to give the designation and full address of the gentlemen elected to the said Committee. The

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers.

<sup>2</sup>W.B. Brett; b 1889; Private Secretary to Governor, Bihar and Orissa, 1921-22; Magistrate and Collector in Bihar and Orissa, 1922-29; Finance Secretary, Bihar and Orissa, 1929-33, Relief Commissioner, 1934; Chief Secretary, Bihar, 1935; issued the Brett Circular on 8 December 1937 which led to protest in the Bihar Assembly; d. 1947.

<sup>3</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).

illness of my daughter-in-law and was unable to meet you. I am thankful to say that the patient is now out of danger and progressing rapidly. I have a mind to spend a few days in Bombay on my way to Belgaum and hope to have the pleasure of meeting you. I have just sent you a letter by special messenger concerning another business. It may be that you may require my presence in Bombay earlier than I expect in connection with that business.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

89. To Henry Moncrieff Smith<sup>1</sup>

To  
Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith,<sup>2</sup> Kt., C.I.E.,  
Secretary of the Legislative Assembly,  
Delhi.

Allahabad, the 28th November, 1924

Sir,

I am in receipt of your letter of the 24th November advising me that my resolution regarding the subject noted in the margin had been disallowed by His Excellency the Governor-General.

The abandonment of the new project of the erection of barracks for the permanent location of troops in Muzaffarpur in Bihar and Orissa.

In reply I beg to say that there is evidently some mistake in the matter as I am not aware of having given notice of any such resolution.

I have the honour to be,  
Sir,  
Your obedient servant,  
(Motilal Nehru)

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers

<sup>2</sup>Henry Moncrieff Smith; b. 1873; entered I.C.S. 1897; posted to U.P. as Assistant Commissioner; District and Sessions Judge, 1908, Deputy Secretary, Indian Legislative Department, 1915; Joint Secretary, 1919, Secretary, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1921-24, Council of State 1921-23, President of the Council of State and of the Statute Law Revision Committee, 1924-32; Deputy Chairman, Round Table Conference Consultative Committee, 1932; Chairman, Indian Red Cross Society; d. 1951.

Correspondence

Please exert your influence changing venue to Belgaum.

Motilal Nehru  
Anand Bhawan. 1.12.24

94. To Purshotamdas Thakurdas<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan.  
Allahabad.  
2nd. December 1924

Dear Sir Purshotamdas,

You left Bombay suddenly on business and I was compelled to follow suit under painful circumstances. News was received of the serious illness of my daughter-in-law and I had to leave abruptly with Dr. Purandare<sup>2</sup> the famous obstetrician of your city. On arrival here I found the baby in a precarious condition and the poor thing passed away within the next few hours. I am thankful however to say that my daughter-in-law is making fair progress towards recovery and Dr. Purandare was able to go back the other day after pronouncing her to be quite out of danger.

I wonder what the cumulative effect of the recommendations of the Tariff Board, the resolution of the Government thereon and your own endeavours has been on the position of our friend Tata. I do hope that the outlook is now much brighter than it was.

I had intended to have long talks with you during my last visit to Bombay which I had hoped to prolong after the various meetings but that visit was unfortunately cut short and we were separated even before it came to an end. The next opportunity I can have will be when I go to Belgaum for the Congress. It is my intention to spend 4 or 5 days in Bombay probably from the 18th to the 22nd but whether I will be able to carry it out rests on the knees of the Gods.

One of the subjects on which I intended to have a talk with you was the collection of funds for the Swaraj Party and the attitude of our friend F.E. about it. You will remember that I wrote a very long letter to him copy of which was sent to you. In that letter besides the further collection of funds there were two specific matters calling for definite replies. One was a request to confirm the various remittances received here from time to time a complete list of which was given in the letter. The other was an enquiry relating to a sum of Rs. 500/- which under F.E.'s instructions was credited to my private account and I wanted to know why that was so. The only answer I got to

<sup>1</sup>Purshotamdas Thakurdas Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Dr. N.A. Purandare; b. 1877; Gynaecologist and Obstetrician; Professor of Midwifery and Gynaecology, Grant Medical College, Bombay, 1906-10; Honorary Gynaecologist, King Edward Memorial Hospital for many years; member, Managing Council, College of Physicians and Surgeons, 1929; Fellow, Bombay University representing Professors, 1930; Honorary Fellow, Indian Academy of Medical Sciences, 1961; Fellow, College of Physicians, Bombay, and its President, 1960-63, d. 1964.



undersigned will be obliged if the gentlemen elected or proposers and seconders will now furnish him with their addresses and the names of the party or association to which they belong.

Motilal Nehru

92. To C Y Chintamani<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad  
1.12.1924

Dear Mr Chintamani,

I was profoundly impressed with our proceedings at Bombay and am of opinion that it will be to the good of all if the various party conferences are held at one and the same time and place. Mr. Mohamed Ali has already extended a warm welcome to all parties at Belgaum on behalf of the Congress and I need hardly say that the Swaraj Party will heartily join in honouring the guests. We have enough in common to make joint sessions of all parties a special and telling feature of the political week. Other matters can be dealt with separately.

I have just sent a long telegram to Mr. Jinnah to exert his influence with the committee of the Muslim League to revise their decision to hold their meeting at Bombay. But it is a purely communal gathering and we shall not lose much if they do not agree. What matters is the assembling of all nationalist parties who work on non-communal lines. I am sure you will agree with me and try your best to change the venue of the next meeting of the Liberal Federation from Lucknow to Belgaum.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

93. Telegram to M.A. Jinnah<sup>2</sup>

Jinnah  
Maidens Hotel Delhi

Earnestly request you reconsider decision to hold Muslim League Bombay stop Enormous advantages in all political parties meeting Belgaum this juncture stop Differences few which can wait agreements many specially on current politics requiring joint decisions stop No sacrifice of principles involved in parties meeting by invitation as distinct bodies on common subjects stop

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.)

<sup>2</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).

*Correspondence*

January Have again wired advise you wire him direct care Khilafat Bombay.

Motilal Nehru  
Anand Bhawan, Allahabad 2 12.24

96. *To Purshotamdas Thakurdas*<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan.  
Allahabad.  
3rd December 1924

Dear Sir Purshotamdas,

Your letter of the first December was delivered to me soon after I posted mine. Your request is being complied with and letters to some Party members of both wings of the Nationalist Party together with a copy of your draft resolution attached to each will issue in the course of the day. I quite appreciate the reasons for your refraining from making the same request in regard to your Exchange Bills and have to confess my own inability to grasp all the implications of those Bills. I wish we could both find time to sit together and discuss the Bills. The discussion will take the form of a lecture from you to a pupil very willing to learn. I have no false sense of dignity which would prevent me from acquiring knowledge from the proper source. I hope something will turn up when the tables will be reversed and you will have to sit at my feet as I am now offering to do at yours.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

97. *A Circular*<sup>2</sup>

Anand Bhawan.  
Allahabad.  
3rd December 1924

Dear

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas has given notice of the accompanying resolution<sup>3</sup> to be moved by him at the next session of the Assembly. You will observe that the subject of the resolution is of the highest importance to the general interest of the country. I have no doubt that the Nationalist Party will be glad to adopt it as a Party. I am therefore requesting a number of members to give notice of the same resolution in order to ensure a prominent

<sup>1</sup>*Purshotamdas Thakurdas Papers*

<sup>2</sup>*41CC Papers (Supt.)*.

<sup>3</sup>See Appendix III. 6.

that letter was simply a couple of lines informing me that you had undertaken to see to the further collection of funds. I was a bit surprised to receive that curt reply and had considerable misgivings in my own mind about having unconsciously annoyed F.E. by something or other. As that letter was received shortly before I was to leave for Bombay I simply wrote back to F.E. as I did to other friends informing him of my arrival in Bombay and looking forward to the pleasure of seeing him, but as you know, circumstances intervened to deprive me of that pleasure. Now I do not know what to think of F.E.'s short letter and shall feel obliged by your throwing some light on it. For my part I am looking upon F.E. as the same kind friend that he has so far been and have recently sent him a special messenger at the insistence of a client to ask if he could take up the financing of an important law suit to be shortly instituted either in these Provinces or in Behar. The messenger has not yet come back nor submitted any report.

So far as the needs of my Party are concerned they are becoming greater and greater as the responsibility of the Party is increasing. You are aware that the whole burden of the political work in the country has now fallen upon us and we are fast drifting into strong currents of public life. We have to try for all we are worth to keep our feet on the ground and our heads above water. I need say no more as I can rely on your taking a correct measure of men and things under all circumstances.

I hope you will find time to go to Belgaum. I know it is not in your constitution to take an active part in proceedings of the nature to be held at Belgaum, but I strongly recommend a visit with the most important object of studying the prevailing conditions on the spot and forming your own judgment thereon.

The next Session of the Assembly is likely to be a stormy one. I expect to be thrown in the difficult position of having to raise the storm on the one hand and check its fury on the other. I hope however to be able to steer clear of all dangers with the advice and help of cool headed friends in the Assembly. It will be invidious to name them but you know who I mean.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

#### 95 Telegram to Gopalrao Dalvi<sup>1</sup>

Gopalrao Dalvi<sup>2</sup>  
Tulsibagh Road  
Nagpur

Your letter had proposed fifteenth December but Abul Kalam Azad wants

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.)

<sup>2</sup>Gopalrao Dayiba Dalvi; b. 1880 at Murbad in Thane district, Maharashtra; educated up to Matric; served as a clerk in K.B. Dushaw Petit Mill, 1902; Editor and Publisher, *Maratha Akira*, Bombay, 1909-16; Sub-Editor, *Indu Prakash*, Bombay; Secretary, Madhya Prant (Marathi) Hindu Sabha, 1923-35; left Hindu Sabha in 1935 and joined the anti-Brahmin movement of Keshavrao Jedhe; Editor, *Janata Weekly*; worked for the upliftment of Maratha community and established many institutions; d. 1951.

place in the ballot. I hope you will do the needful if you agree. . . .

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

98. To Mohanlal Saksena<sup>1</sup>

4th December 1924

Dear Mohanlal,

I have received copies of the letters of Chowdhri Jai Narain<sup>2</sup> and Chowdhri Keshava Chandra Singh<sup>3</sup> sent by you.

As to the first it is well known that I approved of his candidature on being assured that he had signed the pledge of the Swaraj Party. Thakur Moti Singh<sup>4</sup> was specially deputed to get my approval of one of the two rival candidates. The undertaking itself is not with me but I had no reason to doubt Thakur Moti Singh's words. The election itself is in dispute and I believe proceedings have already commenced. I am therefore instructing Messrs Dwarka Prasad and Jia Ram Saxena<sup>5</sup> that no assistance is to be given by the Party or any of the workers to Chowdhri Jai Narain.

As regards Chowdhri Keshava Chandra Singh I attach herewith the original undertaking duly signed by him in which he has made no alterations whatever. It is true that we had opened a purely Council section of the Party which was open to those who were not regular members of the Party and did not subscribe to all its principles. But that did not mean that we had closed the membership of the general Party from that date. You will observe from the original undertaking herewith enclosed that Chowdhri Keshava Chandra Singh offered himself as a regular member of the Swaraj Party and undertook to "faithfully follow the principles and policy of the Party as laid down in its programme passed at Allahabad on the 22nd February 1923." I enclose a

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Chowdhri Jai Narain Singh; b. 1885; social and political worker; Secretary, Bareilly Bar Association for nearly 26 years; Swarajist member, U.P. Legislative Council, 1924-26; Life member, Board of Control, Bareilly College, served on its Managing Committee in various capacities; d. 1945.

<sup>3</sup>Keshav Chandra Singh Chaudhry, b. 1891; lawyer; member, U.P. Legislative Council, 1923-26, 1930-36, U.P. Legislative Assembly, 1937-46; Chairman, Education Committee, Banda, Divisional Scouts Commissioner, Jhansi division for 25 years; Manager and also President of D A V College for many years, President, Banda Bar Association; d. 1973.

<sup>4</sup>Thakur Moti Singh, b. 1888, belonged to Yudhanti in Faridpur tahsil, U.P.; participated in the non-cooperation and Khilafat movements, 1922; imprisoned for six months; elected to the U.P. Legislative Council in 1923, election declared void in 1924, Chairman, Bareilly District Board, 1929; retired from public life in 1930, d. 1970.

<sup>5</sup>Jiyaram Saksena, b. 1890, lawyer, took part in the non-cooperation movement, 1920; General Secretary, U.P.P.C.C., 1921; jailed, September 1921-January 1923; member, A.I.C.C. Chairman, Bareilly Municipality, 1923-26; elected to the U.P. Legislative Council in 1928, later resigned from Congress and resumed legal practice; was associated with various social and educational institutions; d. 1978.

possession but Chaudhri Jai Narain was supported on the distinct understanding that he belonged to the Party. Please enquire into this matter and report. The original undertaking if available should be sent to me. If not Thakur Moti Singh's statement should be submitted.

I believe an election petition has been filed by Chaudhri Jai Narain's rival and is about to be investigated. It must be clearly impressed upon all Swarajists in the districts that Chaudhri Jai Narain is not to be assisted in any way in the matter of that petition.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

#### 100. A Circular<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan.  
Allahabad.  
5th December 1924

### NOTICE

A meeting of the General Council of the Swaraj Party will be held at Belgaum in the Hall of the Subjects Committee of the Congress on the 25th December at 9 a.m. to consider the draft programme of the Congress Session.

Another meeting of the General Council of the Swaraj Party will be held immediately after the conclusion of the Congress Session. Due notice of time and place will be given at Belgaum. The agenda for this meeting will be:

- (1) the work for the year,
  - (a) in the Assembly and the Provincial Councils,
  - (b) in the country.
- (2) amendment of the Constitution of the Party.

Both these meetings are very important and members of the Party are requested to muster strong.

Suggestions for the amendment of the Constitution may be addressed to Hakim Abdul Walli,<sup>2</sup> Assistant Secretary, Swaraj Party, Anand Bhawan, Allahabad, upto the 18th December.

Motilal Nehru  
General Secretary  
Swaraj Party

<sup>1</sup>*M.S. Aney Papers.*

<sup>2</sup>Hakim Abdul Walli, b. 1884; Joint Secretary, Oudh Khilafat Committee, 1920; in-charge of the National Volunteer Corps, member, Lucknow Municipal Board, 1920-26; sentenced in 1921 for distributing leaflets calling for hartal, Assistant Secretary, Swaraj Party, Allahabad; d. 1941.

preservation of cows and am also fully alive to the economic value of such preservation but I cannot allow any sentiment to override the dictates of reason. It is one thing to make an earnest effort to attain the object in view on a proper opportunity offering itself and quite a different thing to overlook the practical side of the question and persist in a demand however reasonable when there is not the least likelihood of success and the only result to be expected can be an increase of bitterness and communal animosity.

You express your dissent from the resolution passed by the Unity Conference at Delhi but that resolution represents the considered view of all Nationalist Hindus among whom are included men of such orthodox views as Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and other prominent members of the Hindu Sabha. It is impossible for me to discuss the question in the course of this letter and I can only express my firm adherence to that resolution.

My attention has been drawn to two resolutions<sup>1</sup> tabled by Babu Shanker Dayal<sup>2</sup> and Babu Sita Ram respectively for the next meeting of the U.P. Legislative Council. I attach copies for your information. Neither of these gentlemen belongs to the Swaraj Party and I do not know to what extent the Party is going to support them as I have not been consulted on the subject.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

103. To Purshotamdas Thakurdas<sup>3</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
10th December 1924

Dear Sir Purshotamdas,

I was glad to receive your long letter of the 6th December. I am sorry the rough draft of your resolution was treated as final and a number of notices were given accordingly. However as I have already pointed out your final draft can easily be substituted within time if you will send it to me at an early date.

It is very agreeable news to me to hear that I have done something from which my friends and fellow workers could learn anything. However we shall soon be quiet and the subject need not be pursued further at present.

The turn that the Tisco affair has taken is fairly embarrassing from the Assembly point of view. As you are aware we have socialists, communists and demagogues in our Party and each wishes to distinguish himself in his own line. It will be a hard job to keep them together. I have sent a cutting to R.D. to get somebody to reply to the criticism contained in it. I am sure he

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix III, 8.

<sup>2</sup>Rai Bahadur Shankar Dayal; belonged to Partabgarh; a leading member of the Partabgarh Bar, member, U.P. Legislative Council, 1920-26, d. 1926.

<sup>3</sup>Purshotamdas Thakurdas Papers.

ed they have lapsed and it becomes necessary to give notice again. Please give notice at an early date.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

108. To Estate Officer, Delhi<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad,  
7th January 1925

To,  
The Estate Officer,  
Delhi.

Sir,

I beg to enquire if the hall of the Eastern Hostel will be available for meetings of the All Parties Conference Committee to be held on the 23rd January 1925 at 5 p.m. The Committee consists of representatives from all political parties in India and also of the more important public bodies including the Hindu Sabha, Non-Brahmin Associations, the Muslim League and the European Association. The meeting may extend to two or even three days.

I have the honour to be,  
Sir,

Your obedient servant,  
(Motilal Nehru) M.L.A.,  
Secretary, All Parties Conference  
Committee

109. To C. R. Reddy<sup>2</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad,  
8th January 1925

Dear Mr. Reddy,<sup>3</sup>

I am in receipt of your letter and post card for which I thank you. The

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).

<sup>2</sup>C. R. Reddy Papers.

<sup>3</sup>C.R. Reddy, b. 1880; writer, educationist and a prominent leader of the Justice Party; member, Madras Legislative Council, 1921-26, 1938; Deputy Leader, United Nationalist Party, 1924, Vice-Chancellor, Andhra University, 1926-30, 1937-49, became Pro-Chancellor of Mysore University in 1949; d. 1951.

105 Telegram to S R. Bomanji<sup>1</sup>

Bomanji  
London

Am resting in Juhu near Bombay stop proposed conference nothing to boast of either but surprised Labour Government fearing make concessions just popular demands stop Swarajists disavow deputations delegations dissociate themselves from Besants so called National Convention composed of persons defeated at election and others having no platform in country stop Sankaran Nair represents nobody Swarajists bitterly hostile Stop Men who count well known suggestions from this side unnecessary consult Lajpat Rai who sailed first April with full instructions.

Nehru

106. Circular for Party Members<sup>2</sup>

Bombay  
1st January 1925

The meeting of the All Parties Conference Committee will be held in Delhi on the 23rd January at 5 p.m. As addresses of all the members nominated at Bombay have not yet been received, it is requested that this public notice will be taken as an invitation to all the members to attend. The place of the meeting will be announced in good time before the date fixed. Members intending to attend are requested to inform the undersigned of their addresses in Delhi.

Motilal Nehru  
Secretary

107. Circular for Party Members<sup>3</sup>

Bombay  
2nd January 1925

Dear

I enclose a number of resolutions<sup>4</sup> to be moved at the next session of the Assembly on behalf of the Swaraj Party. You will observe that most of these were adopted by the Party during the last session but as they were not reach-

<sup>1</sup>Motilal Nehru Papers.

<sup>2</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).

<sup>3</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).

<sup>4</sup>See Appendix III, 10.



friends have promised seventyfive thousand stop Wire what you can do independently of person now visiting you from Bombay.

Motilal Nehru  
Anand Bhawan.  
15.1.1925

*112. Circular for Party Members<sup>1</sup>*

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
15th January 1925

Members of the All Parties Conference Committee are informed that the meeting of the Committee already notified for 23rd January will be held on that date at Western Hostel, Raisina, New Delhi at 5 p.m.

Motilal Nehru  
Secretary

*113. Telegram to C.R. Das<sup>2</sup>*

Chittaranjan Das  
148 Russa Road Calcutta

Your wire crossed mine stop Am in communication with Jayakar, Sobanis and others stop Situation undoubtedly critical but Rangaswamis facts and figures wrong stop Agree contributing ten thousand if balance fully assured stop Wire how much you can arrange and leave rest to me.

Motilal Nehru  
Anand Bhawan. 15.1.1925

*114. Telegram to M.R. Jayakar<sup>3</sup>*

Barrister Jayakar  
Thakurdwar  
Bombay

Last part of your wire not intelligible stop Anonymous friends offer completes all requirements stop Any balance can be easily arranged please have confirmation from Dinshaw, Lalji, Purshotamdas and close with Sobanis stop

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).

<sup>2</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).

<sup>3</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).

subject you have dealt with is too large for a satisfactory discussion in the course of correspondence specially when it so happens that I am unable to see eye to eye with you. I do not think that the Brahman and Non-Brahman question has anything to do with the attitude of the Swaraj Party which has so far not been affected by communal considerations even in upper India where the Hindu-Muslim question is entering upon a bitter stage of controversy. However we shall try to discover some way out of the difficulties confronting us in the C.P. at the Nagpur meeting on the 11th. It is a pity Mr. Das will not be able to attend and we shall have to do what we can in his absence.

Thanks for your kind enquiries. The operation was not performed in the eye but on the lid and was a very small matter not deserving the publicity given to it. There is no trace of it now left and I am going strong.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

110. Telegram to Estate Officer, Delhi.<sup>1</sup>

1. Estate Officer Delhi
2. Superintendent Quarters  
Queensway Delhi

Please wire reply my letter Seventh January asking loan Eastern Hostel Hall for All Parties meeting twentythird January.

Motilal Nehru  
Anand Bhawan, Allahabad. 14.1.1925

111. Telegram to C.R. Das<sup>2</sup>

Chittaranjan Das  
148, Russa Road  
Calcutta-Bhawanipur

*Chronicle* passing into undesirable hands unless Calcutta can take up fifty thousand debentures stop Out one lac twentyfive thousand required Bombay

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).

<sup>2</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).

my breaking journey at Cawnpore. I am writing to you as I feel that you should know it.

Your loving  
Father

116. To S. Satyamurti<sup>1</sup>

25, Western Hostel,  
Raisina, Delhi.  
29th Jan. 1925

My dear Satyamurti,<sup>2</sup>

I am glad you are going to England. I hope that, while you are there, you will do all you can to explain the aims and objects of the Swaraj Party and to enlighten the British public on the ideals for which we stand. I need hardly tell you that since the Party has not yet officially decided to carry on propaganda in foreign countries you will take care not to commit the Party in any manner. I wish you all success in your work.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

117. To B.S. Moonje<sup>3</sup>

25, Western Hostel,  
Raisina, Delhi  
5th February 1925

Dear Dr. Moonje.

I enclose duly certified copies of the statements<sup>4</sup> filed on behalf of the Hindus and Muslims of Nagpur before the Arbitration Board consisting of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and myself, and also the opinion<sup>5</sup> we recorded on the settlement arrived at. I am sending another set of copies to Mr. Yusuf Shareef<sup>6</sup> so that each party may have in its possession the authorised version

<sup>1</sup>*Motilal Nehru Papers*

<sup>2</sup>S Satyamurti, b 1887, member, Senate and Syndicate, Madras University, 1920-42, Madras Legislative Council, 1923-30, Madras Municipal Corporation, 1926-39; President, Madras Swaraj Party; member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1934-43, President, Tamil Nadu P C C, 1935-36, Mayor of Madras, 1939-40; arrested in December 1940 for participating in individual satyagraha, released in August 1941, arrested again in 1942; d. 1943.

<sup>3</sup>*AICC Papers (Suppl.)*

<sup>4</sup>See Appendix III, 11

<sup>5</sup>See Appendix I, 10

<sup>6</sup>Mohammad Yusuf Shareef, b 1890; an eminent advocate; Minister, C.P. and Berar, 1934 and also in the N.B. Khare Ministry, 1937; Founder-President, Mohammad Ali Sarai, Mominpura, Nagpur; President, *Anjuman Hamasi-i-Islam*, Nagpur for over 25 years; d. 1972.

Attend shareholders meeting tomorrow wire result Leaving for Delhi 18th.

Motilal Nehru  
Anand Bhawan Allahabad.  
16.1.1925

115. To Jawahar<sup>1</sup>

Cawnpore—Etawah  
19.1.25

My dear Jawahar,

I was detained at Cawnpore last night by Dr. Murarilal as he thought that a night's quiet & rest was absolutely necessary for me. After that little incident in the car when we were driving to the station I could not get rid of the giddy feeling till I arrived in Cawnpore. All attempt to sleep & rest in the train proved fruitless. Murarilal said I was not looking well & on my telling him what had happened he felt my pulse and declared that the tension was high indicating a high blood pressure. I was hesitating what to do when four Anglo-Indian Johnnies came into the compartment with piles of luggage. Murarilal said it won't do to pass a bad night immediately after the attack, however momentary & that I must immediately have a purgative. I yielded and got out at Cawnpore. On arrival at his house he and Jawaharlal overhauled me thoroughly. The blood pressure was found to be 10 degrees above the normal. The heart was quite sound though a bit dilated as it has been for years past. They gave me a powder & a mixture & put me to bed. I had one good motion at 2 a.m. & another at 7.30 when I rose after a good night's rest except for the disturbance at 2 a.m. They gave me nothing to eat last night & only a couple of biscuits for my tea this morning. I left at 10 O'clock & am now proceeding to Delhi.

Murarilal and Jawaharlal have advised as much rest and quiet as I can possibly have for the next few days and no excitement of any kind which having regard to the stormy session in front of me is an impossibility. I shall consult Ansari tomorrow & see how I feel during the next few days. I do not think there is any cause for alarm & that Murarilal & Jawaharlal want to be extra cautious. They are not at all alarmed at my present condition and attach no great importance to the abnormal blood pressure but they fear that the work before me might make things worse. This is more or less in my own hands and I shall try to do as little as I can. But nothing much depends on the success of this or any other session of the Assembly and if it becomes really necessary to give it up in the interest of my health I shall have to do so. I have taken steps to see that no publicity is given to the reason of

*Correspondence*

Ansari is quite good enough for it but I do not want to take any risks. However that may be there is no knowing when Ansari will be ready for it and I know how it upsets you to remain in a state of suspense.

I have given you my ideas & leave it to you to decide what course to adopt. I take it that Ranjit and Nan will be in Allahabad by the end of the next week.

The steel beams have arrived but what about the submission of plans etc. to the M. Board and the Collector? Bachoji undertook to do all this. Has he done anything? He was to take your instructions about the outhouses. Have you given any?

I had the honour of a visit from Sir John Hewett the Ex. Lt. Governor of the U.P. this afternoon. He was in the President Box during the Ordinance debate and came to congratulate me on my speech. He said he was never fully in favour of special legislation but that I had dispelled whatever lingering doubts he had in his mind. I am sorry I went far beyond my time limit and had to be pulled up by the President. The fault was mine but the whole House including the officials resented the interference of the President. Hewett said the President was very sorry afterwards and was going to apologise privately. The clock in the (incomplete)

*119. A Circular<sup>1</sup>*

25, Western Hostel,  
Raisina, Delhi.  
15th February 1925

Dear Sir,

I enclose a copy of the report submitted by Dr. Besant's Committee<sup>2</sup> on the scheme of Swaraj. As you are also a member of the Sub-Committee but were unable to take part in its deliberations I shall thank you to let me know if you are prepared to sign this report with or without alterations. In case you do not agree with the report or any part of it I shall thank you to send me your note of dissent at a very early date so as to reach me before the 27th instant.

Yours faithfully,  
Motilal Nehru  
Secretary,  
All Parties Conference Committee

<sup>1</sup> *AICC Papers (Suppl.).*

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix III, 12.

of the whole settlement for future reference.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

118. To Jawahar<sup>1</sup>

25, Western Hostel  
Delhi  
6.2.25

My dear Jawahar,

Your letter. I have thought over the question of inviting Anand Bhawan to Western Hostel and it seems to me that it will not work. Ranjit and Nan are leaving Rajkot today and are expected on Sunday morning. I do not think Ansari will be ready for you in the near future and the best course is to put off your operation to some other time. I can neither see him nor catch him on the phone. Last night he rang up to say that Rahman<sup>2</sup> would return in about three days. I was then having my dinner and the message was taken by Upadhya.<sup>3</sup> He has since left Delhi and his people say he is expected back tomorrow. There is no knowing when Rahman will come and there is no certainty of Ansari being here when he does come. Meanwhile Ranjit and Nan will have reached Allahabad. There is therefore no point in Betty coming here. As for you, Kamla and Indu you may if you wish it come for the Topa wedding (the personal invitation for which is contained in the enclosed post card) and not for the operation if you can do without it for some time. What I mean is that if the alleviating remedies prescribed by Dr. Mehta<sup>4</sup> are giving you adequate relief I should like you to wait for the operation till we get to Calcutta or Bombay. I had another talk with Gandhiji on the subject and he was of the same opinion but he did not like the operation to be performed in the hot weather. The honest truth is that I have not much faith in Ansari as a Surgeon. Gandhiji thinks that the operation is a very common one and that

<sup>1</sup>Jawaharlal Nehru Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Abdur Rahman Siddiqi, b. 1887, was on the staff of *Comrade*, 1911; a close friend of Mohamed Ali and M. A. Ansari, was involved in the agitation for the release of Mohamed Ali, 1917-18; went to England in 1919; member, Muslim League, Bengal Legislative Assembly, 1937-46, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1946, Mayor of Calcutta, 1940; Editor, *Morning News*, 1942-48, d. 1953.

<sup>3</sup>S.D. Upadhyaya; b. 1899; joined the non-cooperation movement in 1920, served as Personal Secretary to Motilal Nehru, 1923-31, and to Jawaharlal Nehru, 1931-46; imprisoned several times; member, Lok Sabha, 1952-67, Rajya Sabha, 1967-70, d. 1984.

<sup>4</sup>Dr. Jivraj Narayan Mehta; b. 1887, Dean, K.E.M. Hospital and G.S. Medical College, Bombay, 1925-42, President, Indian Medical Association, 1930 and 1945, member, Board of Scientific and Industrial Research in India, 1942-62; Director-General of Health Services, Government of India, 1947-48; Dewan, Baroda State, 1948-49; Minister for Public Works, Government of Bombay, 1949-51; Finance Minister, Government of Bombay, 1952-60; Chief Minister, Gujarat, 1960-63, Indian High Commissioner, U.K., 1963-66, elected to Lok Sabha in 1971; d. 1978.

25 Western Hostel  
Raisina  
Delhi 20.3.25

My dear Jayakar,

I have your two letters. The second has distressed me to a degree. The first did not hurt me at all in the way you have been led to believe. Something you said [in] it did annoy me—not with you but with your “rich men” of Bombay. I am not so silly as to think that there is anything wrong in a fellow worker asking for some contribution from the Central fund for the urgent needs of his own Province. You had a perfect right to do so even if Bombay had paid nothing. What I was annoyed at was the response you got from the “rich men” of Bombay and I expressed my annoyance to Sir P., Kasturbhai<sup>2</sup> and others at the treatment they were giving me.

The facts briefly are these. They promised me Rs 2,75,000/- in Augt. last to be found by Bombay and Ahmedabad jointly. Of this I was to be paid within a week—F.E. and Sir P. giving their personal undertaking to see that it was paid punctually. The other half was to be paid by the middle of Novr. They have not paid the first instalment in full to this day. And they turn round and tell you that they cannot help you for your Bombay work because they have subscribed to the Central fund! I cannot call this as anything but mean—and I gave a bit of my mind to Manmohan Das Ramji<sup>3</sup>, Wadia and others who came to watch their interests when the cotton excise duty debate was going on. Manmohan Das had the audacity to propose to me certain terms which were nothing short of an offer of a bribe if we voted in a certain way. I told him to keep his lakhs to himself and expressed my regret that public duty compelled us to vote down the demand on cotton excise and thus to help them against our own inclinations. Sir P. and others agreed that Bombay had behaved disgracefully and that they had no business to refuse to help you on the ground that they had subscribed to the Central fund. Sir P. has just left me promising to send a copy of the letter he wrote to Mr. Lalji and assuring me that he has taken the “rich men” to task and not blamed you or me.

<sup>1</sup>M R. Jayakar Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Kasturbhai Lalbhai b. 1894; industrialist and banker; President, Ahmedabad Millowners' Association, 1933-35 and Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, 1934-35; Director, Reserve Bank, 1957-49, 1957-60; Governing Trustee, Gandhi Smarak Nidhi, 1949-79 and Kasturba Gandhi National Memorial Trust, 1957-76. member, Direct Taxes Advisory Committee, Government of India, 1967, member, Senate of Gujarat University, 1950-79, d. 1979

<sup>3</sup>Manmohandas Ramji Vora, b. 1857; prominent merchant and millowner; founder of Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau and Bombay Native Piece Goods Merchants' Association and thereafter an important figure in both; President, Indian Merchants' Chamber, 1907-13, 1924; member, Home Rule League; member, Bombay Legislative Council, 1910-20; President, Municipal Corporation, 1912-13, member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1921-23, Council of State, 1925; d. 1934.

120. Telegram to Mahatma Gandhi<sup>1</sup>

Delhi  
23 February 1925

To  
Mahatma Gandhi  
Sabarmati

Lajpat Rai's wire begins Iyengar, Jayakar, Jairamdas<sup>2</sup> and others unable attend twentyth no date before third week March suitable please arrange postponement and wire ends wire instructions.

Motilal Nehru

4

121. Telegram to Mahatma Gandhi<sup>3</sup>

24 Feb. 1925

Mahatma Gandhi  
Sabarmati

Sorry cant spare Vithalbhai on twentyfifth most important budget day please excuse his absence.

Motilal Nehru

122 Telegram to Kantilal Parekh<sup>4</sup>

3 March 25

Kantilal Parekh House  
New Queens Road Bombay

Condolence on your loss congrats on your ascending *Gadi*.

Motilal Nehru

<sup>1</sup>*Gandhi Papers*.

<sup>2</sup>Jairamdas Doulatram, b. 1892; lawyer, 1916-19; actively participated in the national movement and suffered imprisonment; Editor, *Bharatvasi*, 1916, *Hindu* (Sindhi), 1920, *Hindustan Times*, 1925-26, *Young India*, 1930; member, Bombay Legislative Council, 1927-29, Congress Working Committee, 1929-41; General Secretary, Indian National Congress, 1931-34; member, Constituent Assembly, 1946-47, 1948-50; Governor of Bihar, 1947-48; Minister for Food and Agriculture, Government of India, 1948-50; Governor of Assam, 1950-56, nominated to Rajya Sabha in 1959, 1964 and 1970; d. 1979.

<sup>3</sup>*Gandhi Papers*.

<sup>4</sup>*Motilal Nehru Papers*



*Correspondence*

to the post office. But big things are in contemplation and the next three days may bring about startling developments.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

*124. A Circular<sup>1</sup>*

Anand Bhawan.  
Allahabad  
1st April 1925

Dear Sir,

Dr. Annie Besant has written to Mahatma Gandhi and me requisitioning a meeting of the Committee of the All Parties Conference to consider the Swaraj Scheme framed by a section of the Sub-Committee presided over by her. Mahatma Gandhi has informed Dr. Besant that he would be glad to call a meeting of the Committee if it is requisitioned by a sufficient number of members. He has now authorised me to write to the members of the Sub-Committee and ascertain their wishes in the matter. I shall therefore feel obliged if you will send me your views at an early date.

I am to point out that the full Sub-Committee appointed has not yet considered the Scheme prepared by a section of it. In case you wish to proceed further in the matter I should like to know if you would prefer to have the Scheme considered by the Sub-Committee as a whole in the first instance and leave it to decide further steps to be taken if any.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru  
General Secretary  
All Parties Conference

*125. To Seth Govind Das<sup>2</sup>*

Anand Bhawan.  
Allahabad.  
3rd April 1925

Dear Govind Das,

I am extremely grieved to learn of the death of Diwan Bahadur Seth

<sup>1</sup>C.Y. Chintamani Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Seth Govind Das Papers.

You will thus see that there is no foundation for what Mr. Lalji has conveyed to you

21st. March

I was interrupted at the last sentence and could not finish the letter yesterday. But I have told you all the facts. And now I must insist on your giving me a promise. Say that you will never believe any man however high if he tells you anything likely to affect our relations. We know and understand each other better than any third party can. We have heavy odds against us and have to work shoulder to shoulder.

Now for the pecuniary position. Our finances are as low as they can be of a great Party like ours. A good portion of the money received in Bombay had to be spent in organising our forces for the last Congress. You will remember that No-changers had rebelled against the Gandhi-Das-Nehru pact and were showing fight to the very last. It was only after reaching Belgaum that they finally surrendered and not even then without a fight in the All India Committee. I had to spend a good deal of money in the U.P., Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar & C.P. during the Congress elections in October, November and December. In the result all these Provinces with the exception of Tamil Nadu returned a great majority of Swarajists to the All India Committee and in Tamil Nadu the influence of Rajagopalachari was completely broken though we failed to get an actual majority. Obviously the first step to be taken was to capture the Congress. This we have practically succeeded in doing. The accounts are not here but roughly we have Rs 50,000/- in fixed deposit and some 5 or 6 thousand in the current accounts. Can we start papers of our own in Bombay and the U.P.? (one is very badly wanted in the U.P. which serves the whole of upper India) The only safe policy is not to touch this Rs. 50,000/ and try to get more. Your unpaid Bombay promises are about 2 lakhs out of which I was assured at the beginning of the Session that  $\frac{1}{2}$  lakh would come in a few days.  $\frac{3}{4}$  lakh was definitely promised by Manmohan Das Ramji and Wadia about 10 days ago & out of this Wadia undertook to send 45,000/- within the week, another  $\frac{1}{2}$  lakh is to come from Ahmedabad—Not a brass farthing has been received. Mr. Lalji is in the Wadia group. Will you please ask him what is being done? Do not mention the other promises to him—not that I have much hope of their being fulfilled but it is better to keep these things to ourselves. Now that the Assembly has done all that it could possibly do in this Session I do not expect the Bombay *Banias* to think of keeping their word.

Now you know all about our finances. Can you advise me to spend the little we have on one project? It is not enough to start even one paper.

I have had to go into these details to disabuse your mind of the idea that Bombay has paid me lakhs. To tell you the honest truth I shall never forgive myself for wasting so much time and energy over your "rich men" of Bombay. If I had gone round among my poor U.P. men with my begging bowl I would have collected a great deal more in less than half the time. And this is what I shall now be driven to.

I am sorry I cannot give you the more important news as I never trust it

129. To Syed Mahmud<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
13.4.25

Dear Mahmud,

Yes, I will be here on the 16th and 17th and shall be glad to discuss with you the Ethics of Moustaches.

Jawahar is expected tonight.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

130. To Khwaja<sup>2</sup>

Anand Bhawan  
Allahabad  
15th April 1925

My Dear Khwaja,

I have been very anxious about you ever since you cut yourself off from all decent occupations and have been seriously thinking how to avert the danger of your name being entered in Register No. 10. I am glad to say that I have at last hit upon the right thing for you to do to be looked upon as "Honourable".

The general elections for the Council of State will be held in November next. You must have seen how disgracefully the present House of "Elders" has behaved. Whatever good we could squeeze out of the Independents in the Assembly was turned down in the Council of State. You must make up your mind to stand for election from the U.P. West (Mohamedan) Constituency which comprises the Allahabad, Jhansi, Agra, Rohilkhand, Meerut and Kumaun divisions. Your opponent in all probability will be Raza Ali or Yamin Khan<sup>3</sup>. You are doubly qualified to be a candidate for election as a land owner paying not less than Rs. 5000/- per annum Government revenue and as a non-official chairman of Municipal Board and have every chance of success against both your opponents. The Constituency appears to be a very large one but the franchise being high (Rs. 5000/-) the electorate is by no means larger than the one you adopted for the U.P. Council.

Please let me have your consent at once so that I may announce you as

<sup>1</sup>Syed Mahmud Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Motilal Nehru Papers.

<sup>3</sup>Mohammad Yamin Khan, b. 1888; Barrister; started practice at Meerut in 1914; member, Meerut Municipal Board, 1916 and Chairman, 1917. member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1920-23, 1927-34, 1945-47, Council of State, 1924

127. To Lalji Narang<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
3rd April 1925

Dear Mr. Lalji,

I have purposely delayed replying to your letter of the 22nd March forwarded to me here from Delhi as you were to be away from Bombay all this time.

Thanks for the remittance of Rs 2500/- on behalf of Narottam Morari duly intimated to me by the Allahabad Bank. I am now patiently waiting for further developments in the matter of Mr. Wadia's gift. I have just written something about it and about other Bombay donors to Sir Purshotamdas which you are quite welcome to see.

I quite appreciate the necessity of our having the control of at least one of the two daily Indian papers of Bombay but it is all a question of money. That rests entirely with you and other Bombay friends. My presence in Bombay will in no way help in the matter. I think I have had enough of Bombay and must seek "fresh fields and pastures new".

Hoping to hear from you at an early date.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

128. To Syed Mahmud<sup>2</sup>

Anand Bhawan.  
Allahabad.  
6th April 1925

Dear Mahmud,

You will remember that when we were motoring from Nagpur to Jubbulpore you mentioned a gentleman whom you recommended as the most capable editor of an Urdu Daily. I am now making the necessary arrangements to start the paper, and should like to see this gentleman and discuss matters with him personally. Will you kindly ask him to see me as soon as he can. His travelling expenses both ways will be paid.

I intend staying in Allahabad for the rest of the month except for a couple of days absence at Patna to see Mr. Das at the end of this week or the beginning of the next. Jawaharlal has gone on a *Khaddar* tour with Shankarlal Banker and is expected here for a few hours on the 9th.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).

<sup>2</sup>Syed Mahmud Papers.

Samaldas<sup>1</sup> to be returned again. They have all behaved most shabbily during the last session.

You must have read Mr. Jinnah's interview to the press about the Swarajists and Independents in the Assembly. It is the most mischievous thing coming as it does from the leader of the Independent Party. It has driven me into the controversy and I must in self-defence leave no stone unturned to justify my own party. I am therefore contributing a series of articles on the subject to the Press, the first two of which have already been wired to the *Bombay Chronicle*, the *Forward* and the *Hindustan Times* and the remaining ones will follow. As you will expect am going to give it hot to Mr. Jinnah and cannot possibly avoid it.

Yours sincerely  
(Motilal Nehru)

132. Telegram to Tara Singh<sup>2</sup>

Tara Singh<sup>3</sup>  
Care Shiromani Gurdwara Prabandhak Committee  
Amritsar

Extremely grieved to hear fresh atrocities on Shahidi Jatha stop Regret very much that indifferent health prevents long journey in this weather stop Wire if visit of Lala Duni Chand of Ambala will suffice.

Motilal Nehru  
Anand Bhawan. 20.4.25

133. Telegram to Tara Singh<sup>4</sup>

Tara Singh  
Care Shiromani Gurdwara  
Amritsar

Your second telegram have wired Administrator Nabha to allow two

<sup>1</sup>Sir Lalubhai Samaldas Mehta; b. 1863; was one of the first in India to start cooperative movement; founder of Bombay Central Cooperative Bank and Bombay Provincial Co-operative Bank. member, Bombay Legislative Council, 1910-20, Senate of Bombay University, 1912-36, Council of State, 1921-25; President, Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau; temporary Revenue Member, Government of Bombay, June-September, 1925; d. 1936.

<sup>2</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).

<sup>3</sup>Tara Singh; b. 1885; embraced Sikhism in 1902, Headmaster, Khalsa High School, Lyallpur; took part in Gurdwara Reform Movement; played a significant role in Sikh politics for four decades and imprisoned several times; d. 1967.

<sup>4</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).

the Swarajist candidate and begin to work for you without loss of time. There are no ministers in the Council of State and no other offices to be accepted. The only difference therefore between you and the Swarajists in their Council policy disappears. The work of the Council chiefly lies on the constructive side on which there can be no possible difference between you and the Swarajists.

I have written to Sherwani asking him to suggest names without mentioning you. He has not yet replied and I cannot wait for him any longer. The only other Mohamadan constituency is the U.P. East comprising Lucknow, Fyzabad, Benaras and Gorakhpur divisions. It is rumoured that the Raja of Mahmudabad is going to stand from this constituency but I do not believe it. We will set up our own man from that constituency also.

Please reply early as I am going to leave Allahabad for a change in a few days.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

131. To Lalji Naranji<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
19th April 1925

Dear Mr. Lalji,

Thanks for your letter and the remittance of Rs 25,000 duly intimated by the Allahabad Bank. I can appreciate the difficulties you have mentioned and am grateful to you for all the trouble you have taken. I hope you will also appreciate my position and the complications into which I have been landed by the inability of Bombay to carry out its good intentions within time. As you know public business cannot stand still nor can be carried on without expenses. The breaking up of a handsome amount into small bits has the result of shutting out big undertakings and the employment of the bits on smaller undertakings which though equally necessary do not make the same impressions on the outside world as bigger things do. You can realise the significance of what I have said when you bear in mind that the amount promised in June 1924 and earmarked for the expense of that year has not yet been fully paid. In these circumstances my despair of Bombay is not without foundation. I hope you will take early steps to see that the balance is remitted at an early date.

What are you doing about the general election to the Council of State which is to come off in November next. To be frank with you I do not like the existing Bombay contingent including my very dear friend Mr. Lalubhai

136. To Purshotamdas Thakurdas<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
27th April 1925

Dear Sir Purshotamdas,

I must apologise for allowing your letter of the 16th instant to remain unacknowledged so long. I have since heard from Mr. Lalji and also received a remittance of twenty-five from him. I am aware of the condition of the Bombay market and fully appreciating the difficulties of Mr. Lalji have no wish to press our friends unduly. But there should at least be complete agreement on both sides as to what the understanding was. Mr. Lalji says that he is trying to send the balance which he puts at half as much more making a total of forty. In this he includes Manmohan Das Ramji and Fazalbhaj.<sup>2</sup> My recollection of the facts does not tally with this. As far as the last named gentleman is concerned I thought the amount that was in the course of transmission from Bombay to Delhi had nothing to do with the fresh arrangement arrived at in Delhi. This I understood related to a separate seventy-five out of which forty-five was to come through the Delhi shop within a week and the remainder was to follow before we left Delhi. I hope your own recollection will confirm mine as you were present and it was really through your good offices that the undertaking was given.

I have not been able to do much in the way of starting a paper—English or Vernacular. But you may be sure I shall proceed very cautiously in the matter. I shall seek your advice as soon as anything definite is settled here.

As you have probably by this time come to know Mr. Das has no present intention of going to Europe. As for myself it will be sometime before my Privy Council case is ready for hearing. There are no state secrets to divulge and I know nothing more than what has already appeared in the Press from time to time.

I am not yet in a position to fix a date for the change and rest I proposed to have. I have a number of public, professional and private engagements which will keep me in Allahabad for about another fortnight.

I am sure you are swearing at Jinnah and me alternately at the Press controversy which is now going on. Please do not allow your peace of mind to be disturbed till you come to the end of the chapter. Do not for a moment think that we are creating an impassable gulf between ourselves. We can afford to fight like Kilkenny cats and yet be friends. I should however like to have your opinion on the following passage in the celebrated interview

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.)

<sup>2</sup>Sir Fazulbhoy Currimbhoy, b. 1873, industrialist; Chairman, Bombay Millowners' Association, 1907-8; Municipal Corporator for nearly twenty-one years; Chairman, Municipal Standing Committee, 1910-11, its President, 1914-15; member, Bombay Legislative Council, 1910-11, Imperial Legislative Council, 1913-16; Chairman, Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau, 1914-15; delegate, International Financial Conference, Brussels, 1920; Sheriff of Bombay, 1926; financial supporter of Swaraj Party; d. 1970.

Assembly members visit Camp jails stop shall depute Punjab members after Administrators reply.

Motilal Nehru  
Anand Bhawan, Allahabad. 22.4.1925

134. *Telegram to Administrator, Nabha*<sup>1</sup>

Administrator  
Nabha

Sardar Tara Singhs wire begins Shiromani Gurdwara Prabandhak Committee has received harrowing details beating not excluding pulling of beards and Keshas of the members second Shahidi Jatha in Camp jails Nabha on sixteenth April beating inflicted to extract apologies stop Committee has also received some hairs and beards pulled out stop there are now in Nabha one hundred and fourteen cases of sufferers of this composition as under serious seven contusion of head two face eight arm ten thigh seven shin eight private parts eight back five minor hurts fifty nine stop ends. Will you allow two members Legislative Assembly to visit these jails and see prisoners kindly wire.

Motilal Nehru  
Anand Bhawan, Allahabad. 22.4.1925

135 *Telegram to Tara Singh*<sup>2</sup>

Tara Singh  
Shiromani Gurdwara  
Amritsar

Administrator Nabha refusing permission to members Assembly to visit Nabha camp jails.

Motilal Nehru  
Anand Bhawan. 24.4.25

<sup>1</sup>*AICC Papers (Suppl.)*.

<sup>2</sup>*AICC Papers (Suppl.)*.



## Correspondence

138. To Agent, Allahabad Bank<sup>1</sup>Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
30.4.1925To,  
The Agent,  
Allahabad Bank, Ltd.,  
Allahabad

Dear Sir,

I enclose the Indemnity Bond duly signed in respect of the four Fixed Deposit Receipts which have been lost or mislaid

Out of these I request you to renew the three Fixed Deposit Receipts No. 120/668-670 each for Rs 10071-14-9 relating to my "S.P." account for six months carrying interest at 4%. Please register notice of withdrawal under date.

Please pay the principal and interest due on the fourth Receipt relating to my account No. 3 and credit it to that account.

Yours faithfully  
(Motilal Nehru)139. To Mushir Husain Kidwai<sup>2</sup>Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
2.5.1925My dear Kidwai,<sup>3</sup>

I was not a little surprised to read your letter of yesterday just received. I wonder who the Independent friends are who have advised you to stand for election to the Presidential Chair of the Assembly. The advice may have been intended in all sincerity and I say nothing against the gentlemen concerned but there can be no doubt that if it is accepted by you it will throw an apple of discord among the Swarajists in the Assembly. I say this for many reasons.

The first reason is that at a formal meeting of the Party held at Delhi a resolution was adopted by an overwhelming majority that Mr. Patel be permitted to stand as a candidate for the office of the President. Under rule 16 of the rules of the Party in the Assembly no member of the Party not adopted by it as a candidate can seek election to any office. It is true that Mr. Patel has

published in the *Bombay Chronicle* of the 13th instant :—

"Their (Swarajists') original policy and programme when they entered the Assembly was Non-cooperation and wholesale obstruction. That was abandoned within a few weeks after they entered the Assembly and because the Steel Protection Bill came up before the Assembly in May the Swaraj Party actually changed their constitution and served on the Select Committee of the Bill. Then in August they drafted a new constitution which superseded the one framed in February 1925 "

All this was done because the Steel Protection Bill came up in May ? Malice prepense could not go further. But for this passage I should perhaps take no notice of uncalled for effusion.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

137. To Seth Govind Das<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan.  
Allahabad,  
28th April 1925

Dear Govind Das,

Many thanks for the logs of teak wood duly received. I am afraid they are too thin to be used for panels but they will do quite well for frames, *Chonkhats*, etc. If your forest does not yield any timber about 3 times the girth of that you have sent I will not trouble you to send any more as those you have sent will be quite enough for the purpose for which they can be used. Kindly instruct your men to send me an invoice giving the total cost including carriage etc

I am glad you have taken a holiday to the hills. I wish I were as lucky but I am afraid I cannot get out of Allahabad for sometime to come as I have many public, professional and private engagements to keep before I can leave

I note what you say about the C.P. Swarajists and am thinking what action to take against them. What about the election to the Council of State? Who is the representative of your province at present ? Do you think it possible to get in one or two Swarajists, if so whom do you suggest ?

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

<sup>1</sup>Seth Govind Das Papers.

## Correspondence

138. To Agent, Allahabad Bank<sup>1</sup>Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
30.4.1925To,  
The Agent,  
Allahabad Bank, Ltd.,  
Allahabad

Dear Sir,

I enclose the Indemnity Bond duly signed in respect of the four Fixed Deposit Receipts which have been lost or mislaid.

Out of these I request you to renew the three Fixed Deposit Receipts No. 120/668-670 each for Rs 10071-14-9 relating to my "S.P." account for six months carrying interest at 4%. Please register notice of withdrawal under date.

Please pay the principal and interest due on the fourth Receipt relating to my account No. 3 and credit it to that account.

Yours faithfully  
(Motilal Nehru)139. To Mushir Husain Kidwai<sup>2</sup>Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
2.5.1925My dear Kidwai,<sup>3</sup>

I was not a little surprised to read your letter of yesterday just received. I wonder who the Independent friends are who have advised you to stand for election to the Presidential Chair of the Assembly. The advice may have been intended in all sincerity and I say nothing against the gentlemen concerned but there can be no doubt that if it is accepted by you it will throw an apple of discord among the Swarajists in the Assembly. I say this for many reasons.

The first reason is that at a formal meeting of the Party held at Delhi a resolution was adopted by an overwhelming majority that Mr. Patel be permitted to stand as a candidate for the office of the President. Under rule 16 of the rules of the Party in the Assembly no member of the Party not adopted by it as a candidate can seek election to any office. It is true that Mr. Patel has

<sup>1</sup> AICC Papers.<sup>2</sup> AICC Papers (Suppl.).

<sup>3</sup> Shaikh Mushir Husain Kidwai: b. 1878; Bar-at-law; educated at Lucknow and London. President, Oudh Khilafat Conference, Fyzabad, 1920; member, All India Muslim League; Advocate, Allahabad High Court, 1921; Senior Judge, Lucknow Bench; member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1924-26, re-elected in 1930; member, Council of State, 1931-37, d. 1937.

published in the *Bombay Chronicle* of the 13th instant :—

"Their (Swarajists') original policy and programme when they entered the Assembly was Non-cooperation and wholesale obstruction. That was abandoned within a few weeks after they entered the Assembly and because the Steel Protection Bill came up before the Assembly in May the Swaraj Party actually changed their constitution and served on the Select Committee of the Bill. Then in August they drafted a new constitution which superseded the one framed in February 1925."

All this was done because the Steel Protection Bill came up in May? Malice prepense could not go further. But for this passage I should perhaps take no notice of uncalled for effusion.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

137 To Seth Govind Das<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad,  
28th April 1925

Dear Govind Das,

Many thanks for the logs of teak wood duly received. I am afraid they are too thin to be used for panels but they will do quite well for frames, *Chonkhars*, etc. If your forest does not yield any timber about 3 times the girth of that you have sent I will not trouble you to send any more as those you have sent will be quite enough for the purpose for which they can be used. Kindly instruct your men to send me an invoice giving the total cost including carriage etc.

I am glad you have taken a holiday to the hills. I wish I were as lucky but I am afraid I cannot get out of Allahabad for sometime to come as I have many public, professional and private engagements to keep before I can leave.

I note what you say about the C.P. Swarajists and am thinking what action to take against them. What about the election to the Council of State? Who is the representative of your province at present? Do you think it possible to get in one or two Swarajists, if so whom do you suggest?

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

## Correspondence

138. To Agent, Allahabad Bank<sup>1</sup>Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
30.4.1925To,  
The Agent,  
Allahabad Bank, Ltd.,  
Allahabad

Dear Sir,

I enclose the Indemnity Bond duly signed in respect of the four Fixed Deposit Receipts which have been lost or mislaid.

Out of these I request you to renew the three Fixed Deposit Receipts No. 120/668-670 each for Rs 10071-14-9 relating to my "S.P." account for six months carrying interest at 4%. Please register notice of withdrawal under date.

Please pay the principal and interest due on the fourth Receipt relating to my account No. 3 and credit it to that account.

Yours faithfully  
(Motilal Nehru)139. To Mushir Husain Kidwai<sup>2</sup>Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
2.5.1925My dear Kidwai,<sup>3</sup>

I was not a little surprised to read your letter of yesterday just received. I wonder who the Independent friends are who have advised you to stand for election to the Presidential Chair of the Assembly. The advice may have been intended in all sincerity and I say nothing against the gentlemen concerned but there can be no doubt that if it is accepted by you it will throw an air of discord among the Swarajists in the Assembly. I say this for many reasons.

The first reason is that at a formal meeting of the Party held at Delhi a resolution was adopted by an overwhelming majority that Mr. Patel should not stand as a candidate for the office of the President. Under the rules of the Party in the Assembly no member of the Party not admitted as a candidate can seek election to any office. It is true that Mr. Patel

not been formally adopted but he is the only member of the Party who has been permitted to stand with a view to find out what support he is likely to get from Non-Swarajists. This permission means that among the Swarajists he was considered to be the person most suitable to be adopted provided that there was a fair chance of his being elected. The only other man whose name was mentioned as likely to succeed was Mr. Kelkar but the Party decided that only one member should be permitted to stand. In face of these decisions it is quite out of the question for me as Leader of the Party or any individual member to assent directly or indirectly to the candidature of any one except Mr. Patel.

My second reason is that Mr. Patel is the only member of the Party who can possibly have any chance. You are entirely mistaken when you say that no Independent is going to support him.

My third reason is (and you will pardon my being perfectly frank) that you have so far not taken a keen interest or shown earnestness in the work of the Assembly. For the most part you have been absent though during the last Delhi Session you stood by your Party in its uphill work which I fully appreciate.

My fourth reason is that I have a shrewd suspicion that your candidature will mean the introduction of the Hindu-Muslim question into the Party—a question from which it has so far been absolutely free.

It is needless for me to give any more reasons for the opinion I have expressed as the first is quite conclusive. You cannot enter the competition so long as you are a member of the Party, and you cannot help being a member of the Party so long as you are in the Assembly. I do not quite follow you when you say "I am a Swarajist whether a member of the Swaraj Party or not". I hold that you are as much a member of the Swaraj Party as any one else can be. You have virtually been elected as a Swarajist, I say this because I would most certainly have arranged to oppose your election had it not been conveyed to me by Khaliq and other Lucknow friends that you had agreed to be a member of the Party. You have since your election formally joined the Party, your name has been duly registered, you paid your subscription, you have attended the meetings of the Party, you have as you admit carried out the whips of the Party. I do not know what else is required to make a person a member of any party. You know that there is no such thing as a member of the Party crossing the floor of the House and joining some other party. Under the rules the only alternative open to a member who wants to leave the Party is to resign his seat in the Assembly and offer himself for re-election in which case he is sure to be opposed by a *pukka* Swarajist.

It is unthinkable to me that you of all others can even entertain the idea of going against the Party to the extent your candidature will involve and I take it that you have written off the letter without fully considering the matter in all its bearings.

Another part of your letter is to say the least most puzzling to me. You

talk of writing to Sir Alexander Muddiman<sup>1</sup> about your candidature. That can only mean your asking for Government help to secure your return. I wonder what evil genius could have put such an idea in your head.

No, my dear friend do not allow yourself to be used as a cat's paw. I am too old a bird to think that Muddiman will go out of his way to chuck his own favourite in your favour unless he hopes thereby to scatter the Swaraj Party to the four winds of the heaven.

The Swaraj Party in the Assembly as such has nothing whatever to do with the Congress franchise. Indeed some of its members like yourself are not even Congressmen but all of them are strictly bound by the rules which the Party has itself framed. I was grieved to see your remark about the Swaraj Party in your otherwise excellent letter to the *Pioneer*<sup>2</sup> in which you predicted its approaching dissolution due as you thought to the Congress franchise. I have not seen your article in the "I.D.T." as I do not get that paper and do not care to know what it says, but I should like to know what you have to say about the Jinnah-Nehru controversy which has not yet come to an end. I have yet to write the last article of the series which ill-health has prevented me so far from writing. Please send me a cutting.

I hope you will take this letter in the spirit in which it is written and consider the matter fully before you take the suicidal step you propose.

Yours sincerely  
(Motilal Nehru)

140. To Ramlal<sup>3</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad  
7.5.1925

Dear Ramlal,<sup>4</sup>

As you have probably seen in the papers Mr. Das has suddenly given me

<sup>1</sup>Alexander Phillips Muddiman; b. 1875, Under Secretary to the Government of Bengal, 1903, Registrar of the High Court at Fort William, Madras, 1905; Additional Member of the Imperial Legislative Council, 1915; Secretary to the Indian Legislative Department, 1915-21; Officiating Law Member, 1919, President, Council of State, 1920-24; Chairman, Reforms Inquiry Committee, Home Member, Governor-General's Executive Council and Leader of the Indian Legislative Assembly, 1924-27; Governor, United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, 1927, d. 1928.

<sup>2</sup>The *Pioneer* was started by George Allen from Lucknow in 1865 and was published tri-weekly, 1865-69, became a daily in 1869. It passed into Indian hands in 1933 when it was bought by the land-owning interests of U.P.

<sup>3</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).

<sup>4</sup>Dewan Ramlal; b. 1889, son of Dewan Daulat Rai, graduated from Oxford University; started his legal career at the Lahore High Court: Legal Remembrancer, 1925-30; appointed Government advocate, 1933, Advocate General, 1937 and Judge, Lahore High Court, 1938; Chief Justice of the East Punjab High Court, 1947-48, India's first Ambassador to Italy, 1949, d. 1949.

not been formally adopted but he is the only member of the Party who has been permitted to stand with a view to find out what support he is likely to get from Non-Swarajists. This permission means that among the Swarajists he was considered to be the person most suitable to be adopted provided that there was a fair chance of his being elected. The only other man whose name was mentioned as likely to succeed was Mr. Kelkar but the Party decided that only one member should be permitted to stand. In face of these decisions it is quite out of the question for me as Leader of the Party or any individual member to assent directly or indirectly to the candidature of any one except Mr. Patel.

My second reason is that Mr. Patel is the only member of the Party who can possibly have any chance. You are entirely mistaken when you say that no Independent is going to support him.

My third reason is (and you will pardon my being perfectly frank) that you have so far not taken a keen interest or shown earnestness in the work of the Assembly. For the most part you have been absent though during the last Delhi Session you stood by your Party in its uphill work which I fully appreciate.

My fourth reason is that I have a shrewd suspicion that your candidature will mean the introduction of the Hindu-Muslim question into the Party—a question from which it has so far been absolutely free.

It is needless for me to give any more reasons for the opinion I have expressed as the first is quite conclusive. You cannot enter the competition so long as you are a member of the Party, and you cannot help being a member of the Party so long as you are in the Assembly. I do not quite follow you when you say "I am a Swarajist whether a member of the Swaraj Party or not". I hold that you are as much a member of the Swaraj Party as any one else can be. You have virtually been elected as a Swarajist, I say this because I would most certainly have arranged to oppose your election had it not been conveyed to me by Khaliq and other Lucknow friends that you had agreed to be a member of the Party. You have since your election formally joined the Party, your name has been duly registered, you paid your subscription, you have attended the meetings of the Party, you have as you admit carried out the whips of the Party. I do not know what else is required to make a person a member of any party. You know that there is no such thing as a member of the Party crossing the floor of the House and joining some other party. Under the rules the only alternative open to a member who wants to leave the Party is to resign his seat in the Assembly and offer himself for re-election in which case he is sure to be opposed by a *pukka* Swarajist.

It is unthinkable to me that you of all others can even entertain the idea of going against the Party to the extent your candidature will involve and I take it that you have written off the letter without fully considering the matter in all its bearings.

Another part of your letter is to say the least most puzzling to me. You



talk of writing to Sir Alexander Muddiman<sup>1</sup> about your candidature. That can only mean your asking for Government help to secure your return. I wonder what evil genius could have put such an idea in your head.

No, my dear friend do not allow yourself to be used as a cat's paw. I am too old a bird to think that Muddiman will go out of his way to chuck his own favourite in your favour unless he hopes thereby to scatter the Swaraj Party to the four winds of the heaven.

The Swaraj Party in the Assembly as such has nothing whatever to do with the Congress franchise. Indeed some of its members like yourself are not even Congressmen but all of them are strictly bound by the rules which the Party has itself framed. I was grieved to see your remark about the Swaraj Party in your otherwise excellent letter to the *Pioneer*<sup>2</sup> in which you predicted its approaching dissolution due as you thought to the Congress franchise. I have not seen your article in the "I.D.T." as I do not get that paper and do not care to know what it says, but I should like to know what you have to say about the Jinnah-Nehru controversy which has not yet come to an end. I have yet to write the last article of the series which ill-health has prevented me so far from writing. Please send me a cutting.

I hope you will take this letter in the spirit in which it is written and consider the matter fully before you take the suicidal step you propose.

Yours sincerely  
(Motilal Nehru)

140. To Ramlal<sup>3</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad  
7.5.1925

Dear Ramlal,<sup>4</sup>

As you have probably seen in the papers Mr. Das has suddenly given me

<sup>1</sup>Alexander Phillips Muddiman; b 1875; Under Secretary to the Government of Bengal, 1903, Registrar of the High Court at Fort William, Madras, 1905; Additional Member of the Imperial Legislative Council, 1915; Secretary to the Indian Legislative Department, 1915-21, Officiating Law Member, 1919, President, Council of State, 1920-24; Chairman, Reforms Inquiry Committee, Home Member, Governor-General's Executive Council and Leader of the Indian Legislative Assembly, 1924-27; Governor, United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, 1927, d. 1928

<sup>2</sup>The *Pioneer* was started by George Allen from Lucknow in 1865 and was published tri-weekly, 1865-69, became a daily in 1869. It passed into Indian hands in 1933 when it was bought by the land-owning interests of U.P.

<sup>3</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl)

<sup>4</sup>Dewan Ramlal; b 1889; son of Dewan Daulat Rai; graduated from Oxford University; started his legal career at the Lahore High Court, Legal Remembrancer, 1925-30; appointed Government advocate, 1933, Advocate General, 1937 and Judge, Lahore High Court, 1938; Chief Justice of the East Punjab High Court, 1947-48; India's first Ambassador to Italy, 1949, d. 1949.

the ship and gone to Darjeeling. I am very sorry indeed to have given you and your father all the trouble about the Murree house.

Left to myself and in my present state of health I prefer the quiet solitude of Dalhousie and the quieter excursions to Chamba etc. and am supported in this choice by my Medical advisers. Unfortunately Murree has no fascination for me. Being on the road to Kashmir with cholera raging in the Jhelum Valley and the dust and din of hundreds of motor cars and lorries passing up and down it is specially unsuited to an asthmatic like myself and also to Jawahar's wife and child who are both very much below par and are going with me. Mrs. Jawahar would love to spend sometime with your family and when asked to make her choice between Murree and Dalhousie unhesitatingly pronounced in favour of the former, but subsequent family counsels held without me and with Jawahar presiding changed her mind and we have now definitely decided to go to Dalhousie.

This decision is very disappointing in the sense that it has come in the way of our spending sometime together but taking all the circumstances into consideration it is more suited to the occasion. Disappointing as it is on both sides I can assure you that it is not less disappointing on mine than it will be on yours.

Yours sincerely  
(Motilal Nehru)

141. To Mushir Husain Kidwai<sup>1</sup>

11th May 1925

My dear Kidwai,

Though in very weak health I hasten to tell you in reply to your long letter received day before yesterday that to the lack of interest you have shown in the Assembly and its proceedings you have added an exhibition of complete ignorance not only of the principles and policy of the General Swaraj Party but also of the rules of the Assembly section of it. You have evidently taken the remark about wrecking attributed to Mr. Patel from Mr. Jinnah's recent interviews given to the Press. They are a figment of Mr. Jinnah's imagination and were never made by Mr. Patel as I have shown in the series of my recent articles. They were denied by Mr. Patel on the floor of the House and Mr. Jinnah had to admit that he was referring to the statement about mass movement or civil disobedience which Mr. Patel had made in the course of one of his speeches. If you will refer to the proceedings of the Delhi Session of 1924 you will find that when an attempt was made by the Government members to make out a difference of opinion between Mr. Patel and myself I got up and identified myself completely with every word which Mr. Patel had said and showed that it had nothing to do with the Assembly or its proceedings.

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).

## Correspondence

As for your remark that every member of the Swaraj Party should have been left free to canvass for himself among the Independents and others you seem entirely to forget that the sole consideration for selection by the Party was the canvassing capacity of its members. Before it comes to the seeking of outside help the particular member should have the confidence of the Party in his fitness for a particular office. I do not think you will contend that every member of the Swaraj Party is fitted to be the President of the Assembly if he can only secure some votes from non-Swarajist members. The question whether he is so fitted must be decided by the Party and was so decided in this case at a regular meeting held for the purpose after due notice. You cannot argue yourself out of the Party. I am clearly of opinion that you are as much a member of the Party in the Assembly as I am and are fully subject to its disciplinary jurisdiction.

Khaliq was here the other day and he gave me the names of certain persons who had put the idea in your head. I am simply surprised that a cautious man like yourself should have swallowed the bait so easily. There is no doubt in my own mind that you are being used as a cat's paw to break up the Swaraj Party.

It is amusing to a degree that you look upon the fact of your being a Pan-Islamist as a great qualification for the Presidential chair.

Let me again warn you against mischievous intriguers and tell you frankly that the sooner you get the idea out of your head the better it will be both for you and the Party.

I am not aware of any Swarajist seeking preferment from Government for his son or nephew as stated by you. If you will give me definite particulars I shall immediately take action. I do not however see how the defection of one Swarajist, if it be defection at all, can justify another Swarajist in breaking Party discipline.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

142. To Mohammad Yakub<sup>1</sup>

13th May 1925.

Dear Mr. Mohamed Yakub,<sup>2</sup>

My attention has been drawn to a letter published over your signature in the *Leader* of the 11th April in which the following passage occurs:—

"In the Assembly they (Swarajists) would cry on the top of their voices that they had nothing to do with this abominable Government, yet they

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).

<sup>2</sup>Mohammad Yakub; b. 1879, pleader from Moradabad; member and first non-official Chairman, Moradabad Municipal Board; Trustee, M.A.O. College, Aligarh; member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1924-38, and its Deputy President, 1927-30, President, 1930; presided over the Calcutta session of the All India Muslim League, 1927, member, Council of State, 1938-42; d. 1942.

would privately try to secure posts and offices for their sons, nephews and relatives under the same Government and through the help of the individuals forming the component parts of the steel-frame."

I will thank you to be good enough to let me know the names of the Swarajists who have "privately tried to secure posts and offices for their sons, nephews and relatives under the same Government and through the help of the individuals forming the component parts of the steel-frame." Will you also kindly give the names of the sons, nephews and relatives and also those of the individuals "forming the component parts of the steel-frame" whose help was sought and the office or offices secured by such help.

It is open to other parties to criticise the public activities of the Swaraj Party and even to misrepresent them to suit their own purposes. That is the usual game of disgruntled politicians who have forfeited the confidence of the public and the Swaraj Party can afford to ignore it. But when a responsible member of the Assembly makes allegations of facts he is expected to be in a position to establish them by satisfactory proofs. If you are in possession of any such proof I shall at once take disciplinary action against the member or members of the Swaraj Party who are shown to have been guilty of the [gross] misconduct you have attributed to the Party generally.

I have been in very bad health and am going to Dalhousie tomorrow for a change. An early reply addressed *poste restante* Dalhousie is requested.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal) Nehru

143. To H.S.L. Polak<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad,  
14th May 1925

Dear Mr. Polak,

*Rao Narsingh Rao*<sup>2</sup>-v-*Rani Kishori*<sup>3</sup> and others.

Your letter of the 23rd April. I would like you to give the junior brief to

<sup>1</sup>Motilal Nehru Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Rao Narsingh Rao; b. 1894 at Lalpura, Etawah district, U.P., educated at Etawah High School and Colvin Taluqdar College, Lucknow; was given the hereditary title of Rao, son of Balwant Singh and Dunnaju, denounced by Rani Kishori as a supposititious child of Dunnaju, sued for possession of the entire estate under his grandfather's settlement, 1915; Tej Bahadur Sapru appeared as a Counsel for him; Privy Council's judgement ultimately established his right as the son of Balwant Singh but he did not get the estate and he suit was dismissed; spent his entire life fighting the case against Rani Kishori and Beti Maha Lakshmi Bai; d. 1962.

<sup>3</sup>Rani Kishori; b. 1846 at village Digh, Etawah district, U.P.; third wife of Raja Jaswant Singh and stepmother of Balwant Singh; owned about thirty villages and established a commercial institution named Govindji Rani Kishori; donated large sums of money for educational and social institutions; challenged Balwant Singh's right to claim the estate for his son, Narsingh Rao; appointed Motilal Nehru as her Counsel; case was decided in her favour; d. 1921.

*Correspondence*

Kenworthy Brown. There is no practical advantage in having practised in the U.P. and as for the psychology of the parties I hope I understand it just as well as any other. As I shall be present at the hearing I shall lend to the counsel appearing in the case all the weight and authority of the "man on the spot" who has known the parties and their predecessors for the last forty years.

I do hope you take effective steps to prevent the appellant from playing any dirty tricks. I have now definitely accepted the brief and will have to go when the case is to be heard, whatever happens in my absence in India. Please avoid the Delhi and Simla sessions of the Assembly. The next year will be the last in the life of the present Assembly and the general elections will occupy all my time during the latter half of the year.

I have been in very poor health since I wrote to you last and am leaving for Dalhousie today for a change. But all letters are to be addressed to me at Allahabad as usual.

The transcript of the record was despatched to the Privy Council office by the last mail.

I have been asked to prepare a note on the case<sup>1</sup> generally. This will facilitate the preparation of the case for the Respondent. When do you expect it will be time to exchange cases?

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

144. To Kantilal Parekh<sup>2</sup>

Akash  
Dalhousie  
18.5.1925

Dear Kantilal,

I see that you have inherited not only the wealth but the parsimonious habits also of your late grandfather. The least that your friends have a right

<sup>1</sup>*Lakhna Case*, Motilal Nehru appeared as a Counsel for Rani Kishori in the case. Raja Jaswant Singh, the ruler of Lakhna estate, had executed a deed in 1875, disinheriting Balwant Singh, his son by his first wife, and conferring the entire estate on his third wife, Rani Kishori, subject to the condition that if ever a son was born to Balwant Singh and that son attained the age of majority, she was to hand over the estate to the grandson. Consequently, on the death of her husband in 1879, she entered into possession. On the birth of a son in 1894, Balwant Singh claimed the inheritance of the estate for him, Rani Kishori challenged the right and refused to recognise Narsingh Rao as the son of Dunraju whom Balwant Singh had married in 1888. Tej Bahadur Sapru was Counsel for Narsingh Rao. The case went up to the Privy Council. It was ultimately proved that Narsingh Rao was the son of Balwant Singh but the estate was not conferred upon him, for a gift in favour of an unborn son according to Hindu law was void. The suit was thus dismissed and it was held that Rani Kishori was entitled to remain in possession of the estate.

<sup>2</sup>*Motilal Nehru Papers.*

would privately try to secure posts and offices for their sons, nephews and relatives under the same Government and through the help of the individuals forming the component parts of the steel-frame."

I will thank you to be good enough to let me know the names of the Swarajists who have "privately tried to secure posts and offices for their sons, nephews and relatives under the same Government and through the help of the individuals forming the component parts of the steel-frame." Will you also kindly give the names of the sons, nephews and relatives and also those of the individuals "forming the component parts of the steel-frame" whose help was sought and the office or offices secured by such help.

It is open to other parties to criticise the public activities of the Swaraj Party and even to misrepresent them to suit their own purposes. That is the usual game of disgruntled politicians who have forfeited the confidence of the public and the Swaraj Party can afford to ignore it. But when a responsible member of the Assembly makes allegations of facts he is expected to be in a position to establish them by satisfactory proofs. If you are in possession of any such proof I shall at once take disciplinary action against the member or members of the Swaraj Party who are shown to have been guilty of the [gross] misconduct you have attributed to the Party generally.

I have been in very bad health and am going to Dalhousie tomorrow for a change. An early reply addressed *poste restante* Dalhousie is requested.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

143. To H.S.L. Polak<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
14th May 1925

Dear Mr. Polak,

*Rao Narsingh Rao<sup>2</sup>-v-Rani Kishori<sup>3</sup> and others.*

Your letter of the 23rd April. I would like you to give the junior brief to

<sup>1</sup>Motilal Nehru Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Rao Narsingh Rao; b. 1894 at Lalpura, Etawah district, U.P.; educated at Etawah High School and Colvin Taluqdar College, Lucknow; was given the hereditary title of Rao; son of Balwant Singh and Dunnaju; denounced by Rani Kishori as a *supposititious child* of Dunnaju, sued for possession of the entire estate under his grandfather's settlement, 1915, Tej Bahadur Sapru appeared as a Counsel for him, Privy Council's judgement ultimately established his right as the son of Balwant Singh but he did not get the estate andt he suit was dismissed, spent his entire life fighting the case against Rani Kishori and Beti Maha Lakshmi Bai; d. 1962.

<sup>3</sup>Rani Kishori; b. 1846 at village Digh, Etawah district, U.P.; third wife of Raja Jaswanti Singh and stepmother of Balwant Singh; owned about thirty villages and established a commercial institution named Govindji Rani Kishori; donated large sums of money for educational and social institutions; challenged Balwant Singh's right to claim the estate for his son, Narsingh Rao; appointed Motilal Nehru as her Counsel; case was decided in her favour; d. 1921

to expect from you is an occasional basket of good Bombay mangoes but the Alphonso season has been on for some time past and yet nothing has come from you. Bombay mangoes are the only fruit of the kind which can stand a long journey. The Lucknow species is not yet in season and besides is too delicate to stand the journey.

I am going to stay here for a couple of months if not more as nothing less is likely to restore my shattered health. I have got rid of the fever and as is the case with all convalescents am developing not only a sharp appetite but a desire for all sorts of eatables.

What are your occupations now? I hope the stock taking is now complete.

When sending the mangoes please pack them in wooden boxes (those in which kerosene oil tins are imported are the most suitable and if a few holes are bored on the lid and the sides to avail of ventilation mangoes will keep in excellent condition. They should of course be unripe.)

I am staying with a friend for the present but will remove to a separate house tomorrow or the day after. It is called "Cluneavon". The climate here is delightful and promises to agree with me very well. We are at a height of 8000 ft above the sea level and the temperature ranges between 50° and 60°F. Notwithstanding the height I have had no breathing difficulty so far.

Please direct your letters to "Cluneavon" Dalhousie. (Panjab)

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

I am not going to "Cluneavon". Please address Akash Dalhousie till further notice

145. To Jawahar<sup>1</sup>

Akash  
Dalhousie  
20.5.25

My dear Jawahar,

I have received your two letters. Before that I had written twice to Nan not being sure of your movements. As you will have learnt from my letters to Nan we arrived here safe on the 16th with only two *contretemps* on the journey. 1. Upadhia's sun stroke and 2. two days delay in getting the luggage.

We are still in Akash (Hansraj's house). It fully deserves the name as it is perched on top of a hill quite 8000 ft above the Sea & the climate is perfect—but the house is too small to accommodate us. We have been looking out for a house from the moment we arrived. The first choice was one of the

## Correspondence

147. To Kantilal Parekh<sup>1</sup>

Akash  
Dalhousie  
21.5.1925

Dear Kantilal,

Just a line to tell you that we are still in "Akash" but will descend to earth day after tomorrow. Our territorial abode for the next two months will be "Hurst Lodge" which will be our full address.

Besides the fresh mangoes which I trust you will send in due course I will thank you to send me a dozen tins of the best mango pulp which I believe is tinned in Ahmedabad and also some other places in the Bombay Presidency. I forget the name of the manufacturers but have tried this pulp. It is as good as fresh mango pulp. The tins are hermetically sealed. Please see that the tins you send are filled with this season's mango pulp.

Hope you are feeling quite comfortable on the new gaddi.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

148. To Jawahar<sup>2</sup>

Akash  
Dalhousie  
22.5.25

My dear Jawahar,

I have just received your letter from Mt. Abu. I have never been there but have always had a prejudice against it as a health resort. Your letter confirms my intuitive dislike.

I hope this will be the last letter from Akash. In my last I told you that Peterborough was being cleaned and whitewashed for us. In fact I had spent the whole morning at the house giving directions about disinfection etc. Three years ago it was occupied by a lady suffering from phthisis who subsequently died at Lahore. It had never been occupied since & had earned an evil reputation. I saw that it was exposed to the sun on all sides and stood on a plot of its own. The owner had had it disinfected first under the supervision of the military authorities and then by the Municipality. There was really no reason to apprehend contagion after a third disinfection under my own supervision and a thorough exposure to the sun by keeping all doors and windows open for three consecutive days. The house is so constructed that there is not a single room or bathroom which is not penetrated by the sun at some time or other

<sup>1</sup>Motilal Nehru Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Jawaharlal Nehru Papers.



Chamba till you arrive. I shall give you a few necessary tips for the journey later on

Your loving  
Father

146 To Jawahar<sup>1</sup>

Akash  
Dalhousie  
20.5.25

My dear Jawahar,

A strange fate is pursuing me in the matter of finding a house. Only this morning I told you in my letter sent under registered cover that I had taken Peterborough and that it was being cleaned & whitewashed for me. This afternoon a telegram was received from the owner at Lahore that he had reserved the house for his personal use and could not rent it to us. The only other house "Hurst Lodge" available is not so well situated but it belongs to Hansraj's nephew who would charge no rent. I do not wish to be under such an obligation to a man I do not know but if my last move fails I shall be driven to accept the hospitality of my unknown host. The last move the result of which will be known before this letter is posted is this. The Kashmir House called "Cluneavon" is really meant as an investment and is rented every year. It has not yet been taken this season but was offered for Rs 600/- to a friend of Hansraj's the other day by the man who acts as Agent for the Kashmir house property. This gentleman insisted that the rent should be inclusive of all municipal taxes which the agent did not agree to. He has now gone to accept the offer after the usual haggling and he will sublet the house to me. Once in possession of the house in a lawful manner I will snap my fingers at the whole host of Maharajas and their supporters. I shall add a line to say how the deal has ended before I post the letter.

Kamla & Indu are enjoying themselves thoroughly and are quite happy. They are already looking brighter. As soon as the house difficulty is settled one way or another we shall be able to regulate our habits better.

The R/R for the elevator will probably be sent through some bank & you will have to pay Rs 500/- odd besides the freight before you can take delivery. I shall send you a cheque later on. Meanwhile please pay the amount out of the 1000/- I have left with you.

Your loving  
Father

<sup>1</sup>Jawaharlal Nehru Papers.

Do not make the mistake of sending the luggage and the servants by Tonga or Ekka. These must come by motor lorry and will arrive soon after you.

We have enough servants and you will really not need to bring any from Allahabad. But your mother will perhaps want Merai. The Ayah & her husband the bearer we have engaged here are very satisfactory. Betty will be quite pleased with the Ayah.

We shall remove tomorrow after lunch.

I enclose three letters about the water elevator. That from Heatly and Gresham dt. 16th May was evidently written before they received my letter the reply to which ought to go to Joseph according to my instructions. As I have already told you we need not go in for a motor at present. These letters should be kept on the file

With love to all

Your loving  
Father

149. To Jawahar<sup>1</sup>

Hurst Lodge  
Dalhousie  
30.5.25

My dear Jawahar,

I hope you will have returned from Calcutta by the time this letter reaches Allahabad.

I wrote two letters to Nan, yesterday & the day before, rather incoherent and inconclusive. I simply put down such thoughts as occurred to me and was naturally unable to give any definite directions. I have no doubt that both you and Nan will vote for Bombay. In that case all that remains is to take all possible precautions against accidents on the journey.

I do hope you will be able so to fix up your work as to be able to leave with the party immediately after Nan goes to Bombay. A day or two will not matter but if you must stay in Allahabad longer than 4 or 5 days the others ought to leave immediately. Whether a whole compartment is to be reserved or only the requisite number of berths will depend upon the weather. If you are not accompanying the party the Lucknow route will perhaps be preferable but there is really not much to choose between the two routes. The only point is that neither Merai nor Jagannath is active enough to do the needful at the changing stations. If the Lucknow route is taken some one can easily go to Partabgarh to see the party comfortably accommodated in the other train. However I leave that to you.

I have already recommended through journey to Lahore instead of changing into the Pathankote train at Amritsar. There is no point in doing the latter as you cannot arrive at Pathankote in time to leave direct for Dalhousie. The cars that leave Pathankote in the afternoon do not go further than

during the day I was quite sure in my own mind that after all these precautions the house was as safe as any other. At the last moment a telegram arrived from Lahore that the owner regretted his inability to let the house to me as he had made up his mind to reserve it for himself and his family! We were thus thrown back on "Hurst Lodge" the house belonging to Hansraj's nephew for which no rent is to be paid. The owner had given orders for the necessary repairs long before we arrived and these were being done leisurely. When the last rebuff came the pace of repairs quickened and the house is now all but ready.

We started off early this morning to do some shopping and arranged to have a day on the grounds of Hurst Lodge having ordered lunch and afternoon tea for the Sodies (our next door neighbours) and all the inmates of Akash. We have just returned after spending a really enjoyable day.

I am not at all sorry that we were driven to take this house. It is impossible to find a house anywhere which has no drawbacks. In making our first and second choice we confined our attention to three points: 1. proximity to Hansraj 2. accommodation 3. the view of the hills around specially the snows. Hurst Lodge has more accommodation than any of the others but did not fulfil conditions Nos. 1 and 3 and was therefore rejected. The first is not very important and the third is more than compensated by the ample grounds comprising a tennis court, a lovely lawn and nearness of water. One special feature is that this is the only house in Dalhousie which can boast of Chenar trees and there are three of them. Another point is the privacy of the house & the grounds. The only drawback is that it does not command a view of the snows which the other two houses do but a good view is obtained from several points a few yards away. I am sure you will like the house better than any of the other two.

It is in my opinion highly desirable that you should come up here with your mother and Betty immediately after Nan goes to Bombay. In the first place there is no point in delaying departure as the most they can have in the hills is six weeks, and in the second the separation from Nan will not be so keenly felt as it otherwise would. I wish you particularly to accompany the party as I am sure you will not have the chance later and Dalhousie is certainly very different from Abu. By the time you all arrive I shall be fit enough for some of the numerous pleasant excursions into the interiors which are the pride of Dalhousie. Chamba alone is a strong enough attraction.

I am afraid it will be hotter in the Panjab by the end of the first week of June than it was when we came up. I would therefore advise your going direct to Lahore and taking the train which leaves Lahore a little after 9. p.m. either the same or the next day. This train is scheduled to arrive at Pathankote at about 2.30 a.m. but 1st and 2nd class passengers are not disturbed till day break. Motors begin to run from 8 a.m. & you can leave after *Chota Hazri* very conveniently and arrive in Dalhousie about midday. The drive up is a most pleasant one but the motor road is awful. Once you begin the ascent there is hardly 20 yards of straight road anywhere—there are sharp turns and curves at every step and the drivers are very rash or at least appear so to those who are not accustomed to this road. The Motor Co. has put up a notice on every car saying "Safety first—Stop the driver from speeding".

150. To Purshotamdas Thakurdas<sup>1</sup>

Hurst Lodge,  
Dalhousie.  
30th May 1925

Dear Sir Purshotamdas,

Thanks for your two letters. I have so far avoided all work & worry and was therefore unable to acknowledge them earlier. Even now I am using myself very sparingly and must ask you to be content with a mere acknowledgement of your letters. I shall write you more fully later on.

I am taking complete rest. The climate of Dalhousie agreed very well with me and in another two weeks I hope to be able to move about in interior and enjoy the famous sights of the Kangra and Kulu valleys, meanwhile I shall dispose of some urgent business which has been accumulating during my illness.

I see you are holding forth on exchange and currency questions [with your] vigour which shows that you are quite fit and in full fighting trim.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

151. To C.F. Andrews<sup>2</sup>

Hurst Lodge,  
Dalhousie.  
31st May 1925

My dear Andrews,

Your letter of the 23rd forwarded here. As you have probably seen in the papers I have had a very bad time with malaria and other complications recently. I have therefore taken refuge in this quiet hill station and have so far been scrupulously avoiding all work and worry.

During my illness at Allahabad I received two [thick] envelopes from R.D. Tata containing papers relating to the situation at Jamshedpur. They lie among my papers unopened and I have no present intention of attending to them as I am still very weak.

During the last Delhi session of the Assembly there was an informal meeting at which the following persons were present:—R.D. Tata, Jinnah,

<sup>1</sup> AICC Papers (Suppl.).

<sup>2</sup> AICC Papers (Suppl.).

Duncra that afternoon. The best time to arrive at Pathankote is early morning. For this it is necessary to spend the day somewhere and better to do so at Lahore than Amritsar. The train leaving Lahore at 10 p.m. (21.58) is scheduled to arrive at 4 a.m. (3.53) but usually takes from 30 to 60 minutes more. In any case you are not disturbed till after day break. Have a good *Chota Hazri* and leaving at about 8 you will be in Dalhousie by noon. You will be met both at Pathankote and the Motor Terminus where dandies and ponies will be waiting for you as it is a good three miles uphill from the Terminus to Hurst Lodge. Your luggage & servants must come by motor lorry—don't trust to tongas, *Ekkas* or *tum tums*.

Jagannath and Betty's Aya are not needed here at all. Besides Hari and Jessie we have the new bearer and his wife and four *Jhampanis*. There are also a syce and a cook. If you are not accompanying the party Jagannath will perhaps be useful on the journey as Merai alone will not do. If Jagannath comes he can go back with you.

I am enclosing some letters and a cheque. They will speak for themselves. In spite of your precaution two more R/Rs. came to me from the Agricultural Deptt. & were overlooked by me for some days. They were sent to Nand Kishore under registered cover.

Nan tells me that the *Saat* for laying the foundation stone is the 1st June. I am afraid this letter will not reach you before the ceremony as the post will leave Dalhousie tomorrow morning. But I think you know that the masons and labourers are to have a few Rupees worth of sweetmeat on the occasion.

Please ask the engineer to send me weekly progress reports of the construction work.

Kamla & Indu are both quite happy. We have bought the young of some animal belonging to the deer species but no one is able to say exactly what it is. It is a dear little thing with fairly fine fur coat and a beautiful head but the legs resemble those of a Kangaroo the hind legs being much longer than fore ones. The *Jhampanis* give it some *Pahari* name and say that it is very rare and much sought after by *Shikari Saheb* for its coat. The coat is spotted and there is no tail at all. Some say it is musk deer. Goodness knows what it really is. A charcoal woman picked it in the jungle and sold it to us for Rs 3/-. It is the marvel of Dalhousie and the joy of Indu. Her pony is also a decent one but the saddle is rotten. Please see that the Allahabad saddle is put up with the luggage.

I have been fasting today to see how I feel. The result is quite satisfactory. With love to all

Your loving  
Father

152. To Jawahar<sup>1</sup>

Hurst Lodge  
Dalhousie  
1.6.25

My dear Jawahar,

I am sorry to have upset you all by my first letter to Nan regarding her departure to Bombay. When I wrote it I was more upset than you could possibly be when you received it. Fuller consideration & specially welcome change of weather in the plains removed my anxiety & the very next day I wrote to Nan on the assumption that she had to go to Bombay. However I hope my reply to your telegram received this morning and the subsequent letters I wrote to Nan & you have settled the matter.

I have given you all the necessary instructions for the journey up here in my previous letters. I am very glad you are coming with the party. I am sure you will never regret it, for so far as we are concerned this has been an entirely unexplored region. But to do it satisfactorily you require at least 20 days which I am sure you can well spare. Besides Chamba which on more reliable information has turned out to be anything but a beauty spot on the face of the Earth there are the Kangra and Kulu Valleys the praises of which the people here are never tired of singing. Both these can be done in a fortnight with ease and in 10 days by a slight rushing. Kangra can be done by motor but Kulu has not yet acquired any of the vices of civilization.

We are going out for a picnic tomorrow to a place called *Kala Tope* not more than 5 miles from here. The party consists of some 30 heads, men, women and children all relations of Hansraj barring ourselves. Each group of three or four has to take one dish to suffice for all. There will thus be any number of courses.

Please bring some photographs in frames for the drawing room.

My Tucker apparatus has got out of order. There was an older one on my dressing table. I cannot say where it is now as you & Nan have rearranged my room. It will avoid ordering a new one if you can bring it as the two together might have sound parts to form one workable apparatus.

Also please bring two tubes of the Areka nut tooth paste from Guzders.

I must have two clear days notice of your arrival at Pathankote to ensure a comfortable journey for you all. I hope you will not stay in Lahore for more than a day & a half i.e. if you leave Allahabad as you propose on the 5th you will be in Lahore about noon on the 6th. It will perhaps be too short a halt to leave the same night but you ought to be able to do so on the 7th at about 10 p.m. If you do so you will be here by noon on the 8th.

You will of course make the necessary arrangements for watch & ward before you leave. Bchoji should be asked to exercise greater supervision of the building operations in your absence. Sham Sunder should be very alert in the matter of stores and labour.

<sup>1</sup>Jawaharlal Nehru Papers.

Chaman Lal<sup>1</sup>, Goswami<sup>2</sup> & myself.

At this meeting Tata on behalf of the Directors and Chaman Lal and Goswami on behalf of the Labour Association agreed to abide by the decision of C R Das and myself on all questions that had then arisen. There was no formal reference in writing to our [action] but we took the word of [the] two [parties] as [good as] their bond. Since then nothing definite has been submitted to us for our decision except what may be contained in the two closed envelopes I have referred to above. It is difficult for me to meet Das in the near future and I am afraid this reference is not likely to bear fruit for some time to come.

The real trouble is about Sethi<sup>3</sup>. So far as I have been able to gather the Directors are not prepared to have anything to do with him. They might perhaps agree to the general rule that outsiders may be employed as Secretaries of the Union but that will be subject to one exception and that of Sethi. It is all a matter of *zid* on both sides. As you are going to Jamshedpur on the 4th June you may be able to solve the difficulty in some satisfactory manner.

The climate of Dalhousie is agreeing with me very well but I need a good long rest to be quite fit again. I have invited Mahatmajī to come up here for a few days but I do not expect him to accept the invitation. Dalhousie is particularly suited for a change and rest for him, as there are not many politically minded people and there is little or no trouble with *darshamallas* who assemble in large crowds in other places.

Hoping you are quite fit.

Yours affectionately,  
(Motilal Nehru)

<sup>1</sup>Diwan Chaman Lal; b. 1892, *Bae-at-law*; labour leader; one of the founders of the A I T.U.C. and its President, 1927, represented India at the International Labour Conference in 1925, 1928, 1932 and 1946; member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1923-30, 1945-46, Punjab Legislative Assembly, 1937-45, Constituent Assembly, 1946-48; Ambassador to Turkey, 1948-49, member, Rajya Sabha, 1952-67, d. 1973.

<sup>2</sup>T C Goswami; b. 1898 at Serampore, West Bengal; educated at Presidency College of Calcutta and University of Oxford, started practice at Calcutta High Court; left practice in 1920, member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1923-30; Treasurer, Swaraj Party, 1924-25, President, Postal and R.M.S. Conference, Bengal and Assam, 1924, elected to the Bengal Legislative Assembly in 1937 and became Deputy Leader of the Congress Parliamentary Party, expelled from the Congress Parliamentary Party in 1940; joined the coalition ministry formed by Khwaja Nazimuddin and became its Finance Minister in 1943, unsuccessfully contested the general election in 1952 as an independent candidate, d. 1957.

<sup>3</sup>Gurudutt Sethi, b. 1895; belonged to Jhang (now in Pakistan), white collared employee of TISCO, Jamshedpur; dismissed one month after the famous strike of 1920-21, subsequently reinstated; Secretary, Jamshedpur Labour Association, 1920-27; attended the eighth session of A I T.U.C. at Kanpur, 1927, elected one of its Vice-Presidents at the ninth session held at Jharia, 1928, twice went to Geneva as adviser to the Labour representative from India.

Dr. Jaichand<sup>1</sup> is really a clever man. He was here for two days and watched me & the effect of the medicines he gave me very closely. He slept in my room or rather kept awake by my bedside for two consecutive nights watching and studying. I am much better now both asthma and insomnia being considerably relieved. If the improvement continues I hope to pick up a good deal during the week I have here. Jaichand did not accept even travelling expenses. It is hardly possible for me to settle the Thussoo-Kathju complications during the few hours I shall have at Lahore. But I shall do what I can to make things a bit more tolerable than they are at present.

There was a regular cloud burst here this afternoon & it is quite cold.

Tomorrow's *Hindustan Times* will bring the Delhi news of the happenings of today. I hope nothing untoward has happened at Allahabad.

The man Lotan Singh<sup>2</sup> whose arrest they are making so much of is a most suspicious individual. He is a dismissed policeman and my information is that he is in receipt of a handsome allowance to keep egging the Hindus on. On the other side there is the man who put up placards about Mussalman boys being kidnapped by Arya Samajists from an orphanage (I forget his name). He has a similar duty to discharge with his own coreligionists and is in receipt of a similar allowance.

I have reserved Motor & Railway accommodation for the 10th.

With love

Your loving  
Father

### 155. To E. Burdon<sup>3</sup>

Hurst Lodge,  
Dalhousie.  
3rd July 1925

Dear Mr. Burdon,<sup>4</sup>

I am obliged to you for giving me time to consider my answer to your D.O No. 216-S of the 23rd June 1925 enquiring whether I would give my ser-

<sup>1</sup>Dr Diwan Jai Chand, b. 1887 at Rahim Yar Khan in Bhawalpur State; educated at D A V College and K E. Medical College, Lahore; went to England for higher education; returned in 1913, Deputy Sanitary Commissioner, Punjab; resigned and started his Clinic at Lahore in 1915, took to Homoeopathy; Founder-Principal, National Homoeopathic College, Lahore; member, Homoeopathic Enquiry Committee, 1948-50, Homoeopathic Advisory Board, Government of India, 1956; d. 1962.

<sup>2</sup>Lotan Singh was arrested on 25 June 1923, kept in jail under Section 151 of the Police Act as a precautionary measure to prevent any trouble at the Pahari Dhiraj, Delhi during the Baksal days.

<sup>3</sup>AICC Papers

<sup>4</sup>Sir Ernest Burdon: b. 1881; Financial Under Secretary, Punjab Government, 1911; Financial Adviser, Military Finance, Government of India and member, Imperial Legislative Council, India, 1919; Secretary to Government of India, Army Department, and member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1922-26, Secretary to Government of India, Finance Department and member, Council of State, 1927-29; Auditor-General of India, 1929-40; d. 1957.



This is the last letter you will receive before leaving. I cannot think of anything else to say

Your loving  
Father

153. *To Purshotamdas Thakurdas*<sup>1</sup>

Hurst Lodge,  
Dalhousie.  
25th June 1925

My dear Sir Purshotamdas,

Thanks for your letter of the 18th. Das's death has been a terrible shock to me and I have practically been confined to bed from the moment I heard of it. Whatever benefit I had derived from the change to Dalhousie has disappeared and I am much worse than I was when I came here. Things are moving so fast that it is impossible for me to take the rest I need, and I have made up my mind to leave Dalhousie on the 10th July. I am calling a meeting of the General Council of the Swaraj Party in Calcutta about the middle of July.

It has undoubtedly been a very severe blow to Bengal but I have every reason to hope that Bengal will not "give way completely under it" as you put it. However we can but try our best. The future is in the lap of gods.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

154. *To Jawahar*<sup>2</sup>

Hurst Lodge  
Dalhousie  
2.7.25

My dear Jawahar,

I have duly received your letters from Lahore & Delhi and am glad to learn that you have had no return of the fever. You did well to take 10 grs. of quinine when you had a premonition. I think you should continue the quinine for some time, say once a week or even once a fortnight but never take less than 10 grs.

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).

<sup>2</sup>Jawaharlal Nehru Papers.

the 10th and got everything in train to leave here on the 6th. The *tum tum* luggage is all packed and ready and leaves early tomorrow morning, Upadhia, Jessie, and Meraí accompanying. Five *tum tum*s have been engaged & two special cars have been reserved for the day after tomorrow. The programme now stands as follows:

6th	Leave Dalhousie	9 a.m.
"	Arrive Pathankote	1 p.m.
"	Leave Pathankote	3.46 p.m.
"	Arrive Lahore	9.30 p.m.
7th	Halt at Lahore to take things easy & consult Dr. Jaichand.	
8th	Leave Lahore by the Calcutta Mail.	
9th	Arrive Allahabad about noon.	
10-13th	Halt at Allahabad.	
14th	Leave for Calcutta by mail.	

This is a much more rational programme than the other. By the time I leave for Calcutta I hope to get rid of the acute trouble at least.

Cannot think of anything else. Your letters have all come. The news of the monsoon was specially welcome.

Your loving  
Father

### 157. To Mahatma Gandhi<sup>1</sup>

Calcutta, 21st July 25

Dear Mahatmaji,

The Swaraj Party is under a deep debt of gratitude to your generous support on the irreparable loss it sustained by the premature death of its leader, Deshbandhu Chittaranjan Das. You have now redoubled that debt by the noble offer contained in your letter of the 19th July. It seems to me that the only way to repay that debt is to accept your offer in all humility, and strive with your help to meet the situation created by Lord Birkenhead's<sup>2</sup> speech in the spirit of the last pronouncement of Deshbandhu made at Faridpur.

Lord Birkenhead seems to have spurned the honourable co-operation offered by Deshbandhu, and to have made it clear that in our struggle for freedom we have still to face many unnecessary obstacles and many ill-informed opponents. Our plain duty at this stage is, therefore, to go ahead along the line chalked out for us, and prepare the country for an effective challenge to the irresponsible and insolent authority. In the words of the great Faridpur speech, "We shall fight, but fight clean," not forgetting that "when the time for settlement comes, as it is bound to come, we have to enter the Peace

<sup>1</sup>The Indian Quarterly Register, 1925

<sup>2</sup>Lord Birkenhead; b. 1872; leading Conservative statesman; member, British Parliament, 1906-19; Solicitor-General, 1915, Attorney-General, 1915-19, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, 1919-22; Secretary of State for India, 1924-28; d. 1930.

vices as a member of the Committee appointed to examine the means of attracting the best qualified Indian youths to a military career and of giving them a suitable military training.

The desirability of a careful investigation of the various matters comprised in the proposed terms of reference by a representative committee is beyond question and I should have had no hesitation in agreeing to serve on the committee had it been duly elected by the Assembly. The difficulty arises from the fact that the members of the committee are to be nominated by the Government and the further fact that Swarajists are under their constitution precluded from serving on such a committee except when the Party for special reasons decides by a majority of three-fourths of those present at a meeting to permit any member to do so. I have taken time to consider whether there are special reasons in this case to be considered by the Party and have come to the conclusion that there are.

The members of the Party being scattered all over India it is not possible to call a meeting at short notice but a fairly early opportunity for the consideration of the question will be available on the 16th July when the General Council of the Party of which the Swarajists in the Assembly are ex-officio members has already been summoned to assemble in Calcutta. If the question of my serving on the committee can in the ordinary course and without any inconvenience to the Government be left open till the 18th July I shall be glad to take the necessary steps to obtain the decision of my Party and communicate it to you on or before that date. But if this is not found convenient I am sorry it is not for the reasons I have stated open to me to agree to serve on the Committee.

I am leaving Dalhousie on the 10th July.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

E. Burdon, Esq., C.I.E., M.L.A.,  
Secretary to Government of India,  
Army Department,  
Simla

156. To Jawahar<sup>1</sup>

Hurst Lodge  
Dalhousie  
4.7.25

My dear Jawahar,

I passed another miserable night and early this morning made up my mind to leave Dalhousie as soon as possible. There is no hope of any improvement here & the alleviation of tolerable nights with intolerable ones is bound to go on as long as I am here. I therefore cancelled all arrangements made for

<sup>1</sup>Jawaharlal Nehru Papers.

certain negotiations alleged to have taken place between Das and Lytton<sup>1</sup> through an intermediary. It is full of lies which I can easily prove and is inspired by the "intermediary" who is none other than Radha Kumod. There is one point however upon which I have to seek information from you. He gave me the latter portion of a letter or an article intended for publication in the *Comrade*. I do not know if he has actually sent it to you. But I send you a typed copy<sup>2</sup> of one portion he gave me. I draw your particular attention to the portion I have underlined in red and will thank you to let me know exactly what transpired. Was the scheme referred to a scheme evolved by Das or was it something which purported to come as a proposal from Lytton and what were the salient features of the so-called scheme?

I am sending this by a special messenger as I never trust such matters to the post. I am writing to the Associated Press the true facts known to me and shall wait for your reply before I allude to the passage I have underlined. I hope you are improving in health.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

159. To J.M. Sen-Gupta<sup>3</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
5.8.25

My dear Sen-Gupta,

Your letter just received is extremely disappointing. I am not at all sure that my visit to Calcutta will serve any useful purpose and I shall wait for a message from Jawaharlal who carries this letter before I finally make up my mind to go.

Whatever reasons of expediency may prompt the Bengal Swarajists to vote for Fazlul Huq there is hardly any room for doubt that they will bring nothing but discredit on the Party by doing so. I can only go by the reputation Fazlul Huq has earned by his recent antics and have no doubt in my own mind that the Party by adopting him as a candidate for the chair will stand condemned in the eyes of all decent men. I am simply surprised to hear that Mahatmajī "did not think it would be at all wrong to get Fazlul Huq and his followers to agree and sign the conditions" you have mentioned. In plain English it comes to this:—the Swaraj Party is willing to give its vote to a man thoroughly unprincipled by reputation simply on the assurance of the very man and his associates to oppose the formation of a ministry. I for one would not sell my vote for such an assurance even if it were reliable but as it

<sup>1</sup>2nd Earl of Lytton; b. 1876; Under Secretary of State for India, 1920-22; Governor of Bengal, 1922-27; Viceroy and Acting Governor-General of India, 10 April-9 August 1925; d. 1947.

<sup>2</sup>See Appendix III, 13.

<sup>3</sup>Motilal Nehru Papers.

Conference not in a spirit of arrogance but with becoming humility, so that it may be said of us that we were greater in our achievement than in our adversity".

You have now enabled us to fulfil the message of Deshbandhu with the united strength of the Congress at our back. Under such auspices we need entertain no misgivings about the result which can only be what it has invariably been in all ages and countries—the ultimate triumph of right over might.

I desire to say one word about the pact from which you have so generously absolved the Swaraj Party. As you know, both Deshbandhu and I had no desire to have the conditions of the pact altered in the course of the year. We wanted to give it a full and fair trial and it was our wish to help personally in every way in making it a success. Ill-health and many pre-occupations prevented us both from doing as much for it as we had wished. But I entirely agree with you that a new situation has been created by recent events, and under the circumstances the Congress should without loss of time adapt itself to this situation by making itself a predominantly political body. I, therefore, welcome your offer. This, however, does not mean that the Congress should give up in any way the constructive programme. All our efforts would be of little avail if they are not backed up by the organised strength of the nation.

We shall now go ahead in full confidence with our work inside the Councils and outside in the country. And if the occasion demands organised action in the country, I need not assure you that the Swaraj Party will whole-heartedly help in such activity.

(Motilal Nehru)

### 158. To Mohamed Ali<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan  
Allahabad  
28th July 1925

Dear Mohamed Ali,

The man Radha Kumod Mukerji<sup>2</sup> is creating mischief. He thinks that as poor Das is dead there is no one to contradict him. As a matter of fact I can give him the lie on almost every point as Das never did a thing without consulting me previously or informing me immediately after. Luckily I have preserved Das's letters written in his own hand.

I believe you have seen the letter of "Wayfarer" in the *Bengali*<sup>3</sup> about

<sup>1</sup>*Mohamed Ali Papers*

<sup>2</sup>Radhakumud Mukerji; b. 1884; an eminent historian; served as Professor of History in the Universities of Mysore, Banaras and Lucknow; member, Bengal Legislative Council, 1937-43, Vice-President, Hindu Mahasabha for several years, author of several books; member, Council of State, 1952-55, Rajya Sabha, 1955-58; d. 1963.

<sup>3</sup>*The Bengalee* was founded in 1862 by Girish Chandra Ghosh. It lacked financial stability and was taken over by Bacharam Chatterjee, who could not sustain it, and was subsequently purchased by Surendranath Banerjee in 1879. It was converted from a weekly into a daily in February 1900.

160. To Krishna Ballabh Sahay<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
8th August 1925

Dear Babu Krishna Ballabh Sahai<sup>2</sup>,

I have received your letter of the 28th July. After a careful consideration of the contents . . . to advance to your Province from the Central [Fund to the] extent of Rs 4200/- which ought to put you on . . . It is evident that the Central Fund is made up of contributions from the Provinces. Your Province has so far contributed nothing though it has received help from the [Central] Fund from time to time. This advance of Rs 4200/- [may] therefore be treated as a loan to be repaid by your Province within a reasonable time. The amount will be [paid] to you by monthly instalments during the next five [months], the first payment being of Rs 1000/- and the four [standing] payments of Rs 800/- each. These payments will [depend] upon the progress of the work which must be reported from time to time with a full account of the money spent. I enclose a cheque for the first instalment in order to enable you to begin the work at once. Copies of this letter are being sent to Maulvi Shafi and Prof. Bari for their information. Please acknowledge receipt.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

161. To J.M. Sen-Gupta<sup>3</sup>

15.8.1925

My dear Sen-Gupta,

Your letter just received. I am not at all depressed by the result of the election for the Presidential Chair of the Bengal Council. It was a great moral victory for us.

Later press reports of the proceedings of the Corporation on the Pir question then your letter have arrived. The behaviour of the Mohammadan members in leaving the meeting in a body shows that they will create mischief but it cannot be helped. You have to continue the firm attitude you took at the last meeting.

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Krishna Ballabh Sahay, b. 1898; educated at Patna; joined the non-cooperation movement, 1920; member, Swaraj Party, Bihar and Orissa Legislative Council, 1923-29, edited *Chota Nagpur Darpan* for a number of years; courted imprisonment several times during the freedom movement, actively associated with Kisan movement organised by Swami Sahajanand; Parliamentary Secretary, Bihar Government, 1937; Minister for Land Revenue, Bihar, 1946-57; Minister for Cooperation and Planning, Bihar, 1962-63; Chief Minister, Bihar, 1963-67; d. 1974.

<sup>3</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.)

is no sane person can put the least reliance on it. The intervention of Maulana Azad and even of Mahatmaji will not in my opinion save the face of the Party. You must remember that the present reputation of the Party in Bengal is not at all enviable and you certainly cannot enhance it by adopting the course suggested. It would be far preferable to run the risk of a ministry being formed to committing yourself to a position you cannot possibly justify in public even if the undertaking given is adhered to.

What will happen if a ministry is formed? Das and I had no doubt at all as to what was to be done in that event and I understood from him that the Bengal Swarajists agreed with us. In the resolutions of the Ex. Committee passed at Patna copy of which has been left with you, you will find that the Swarajists in Bengal and C.P. were to walk out of the Council Chamber in case a ministry was formed in spite of them and were to be followed by the Swarajists in the Assembly and the other Councils as soon as possible on some suitable issue e.g. the Reforms. Some such action the details of which can be settled later on will do much greater service to the Party and the country than your succeeding in preventing the formation of a ministry by a resort to doubtful tactics.

I quite agree with you that every attempt should be made to get B. Chakravarti to consent. That is the best way out of the difficulty. But if he does not agree you can only select one of the three Swarajists who are offering themselves and vote for him solidly regardless of results.

It is true that the Bengal Swarajists nailed all the lies circulated about them to the counter by bold and straight action in this matter. The course suggested can only give a handle for justly adverse criticism.

I am very much better but by no means quite well. It will be a question for my doctors to consider whether it would be wise to undergo the strain not only of the journey to Calcutta but of the disagreeable things that seem to be awaiting me there. Please show this letter to Bidhan<sup>1</sup> if there is no objection. I am at present living under very peaceful conditions and am making rapid improvement. But I do not mind all the trouble in the world if I can be really useful which is very doubtful. I have had to dash off this letter in a hurry as it must be taken by Jawahar.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

<sup>1</sup>Bidhan Chandra Roy; b. 1882, Congress leader; eminent physician, and an educationist; elected to the Bengal Legislative Council in 1923, Mayor, Calcutta Corporation, 1931-33; President, All India Medical Council, 1939-45; Vice-Chancellor, Calcutta University, 1942-44; Chief Minister, West Bengal, 1948-62, d. 1962.

163. To Govind Ballabh Pant<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan  
Allahabad  
15.8.1925

Dear Govind Ballabh,<sup>2</sup>

On the eve of my departure to Simla I am writing to you on two most important points.

The first is the Municipal and District Board elections. I understand that the U.P. M.L.Cs are taking the organisation of these elections in hand by raising funds among themselves and touring the Province in batches. I am pressed from other quarters to start some kind of organisation for the same purpose on behalf of the Provincial Swaraj Party. It is evident that two separate organisations for the same purpose and in the same interest overlapping each other will only lead to confusion. I therefore suggest that a joint programme be framed and the funds you are raising be supplemented to a reasonable extent by the Provincial funds. So far as the two Oudh Divisions are concerned I am entrusting the work on behalf of the Provincial Committee to Khaliquzzaman and am sending him a cheque for Rs 1000/- on account. It is for you to arrange with him the details so far as Oudh is concerned about your contribution in money and work. As regards the Province of Agra I am not handing over the Province to any particular individual. In the following districts we have influential local workers who can find both money and men and are thoroughly reliable. It will only retard the progress of work if they are meddled with.

<i>District</i>	<i>Name of workers</i>
Bareilly	Pt. Dwarka Prasad Babu Jia Ram Saxena
Mirzapore	Mr. Yusuf Imam <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers.

<sup>2</sup>G. B. Pant: b. 1887 at Almora, U.P.; educated at Ramsay College, Almora, Muir Central College and School of Law, Allahabad, enrolled as an advocate, 1909, member, Nashipur Municipal Board; took part in the Congress movements, 1930, 1940, 1942; Leader of the Swaraj Party in the U.P. Legislative Council, 1923-30; President, U.P.P.C.C. 1927-30, member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1934-36, Leader of the Congress Party in the U.P. Legislative Assembly, 1937 and Premier 1937-39, Chief Minister, U.P. 1946-55; Minister for Home Affairs, Government of India, 1955-61; awarded the Bharat Ratna, 1957, d. 1961

<sup>3</sup>Yusuf Imam, b. 1896, belonged to Mirzapur, U.P.; educated at Calcutta, Oxford and Cambridge Universities, Bar-at-law, 1917; started practice at Mirzapur in 1918, gave up practice to participate in the non-cooperation movement, 1921; joined Swaraj Party; member, District Congress Committee; Chairman, Mirzapur District Board; member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1923-29, resigned, 1930, took part in salt satyagraha, 1930 and Quit India movement, 1942; suffered long terms of imprisonment, d. 1944.



I am starting off for Simla tomorrow and am busy packing. I hope you will write to me from time to time and keep me in touch with Bengal affairs.

I am in the same state of health you saw me. On return from Calcutta there was a slight relapse but I have got over it.

Yours sincerely  
(Motilal Nehru)

162. To M.R. Jayakar<sup>1</sup>

15.8.1925

My dear Jayakar,

The all too short press reports of the hitch that has arisen in the even tenor of your Council work are somewhat disconcerting. I am of course unable to form any opinion until I know all the facts but it seems to me that the action of Mr. Joshi<sup>2</sup> in refusing to move the introduction of the other bills standing to his name after leave was refused to introduce the first was a bit hasty. The statement you made was a dignified one and after that statement it would have been well to move for leave to introduce one or two more bills to put the Non-Brahmin Party entirely in the wrong. Their siding with the Government on the first motion did not necessarily show that they would do the same with all other bills. I should have selected some 3 or 4 bills of undoubted public utility and challenged the Non-Brahmins to go against the interests of the people repeatedly. They would surely have acted as they did in the case of the first bill and thus exposed themselves to public ridicule and completely wrecked their chances at the next general election. The next point upon which the brief press report leaves me in doubt is the object with which the Swarajist members remained sitting in the Council Chamber after declaring that they were taking no part in the proceedings. I should have expected such a declaration to be followed by a general exodus of the Swarajists from the Council Chamber. However I do not profess to judge the Bombay Swarajists or criticise their conduct but have offered such suggestions as occurred to me on reading today's newspapers. It is quite possible that at some stage of the proceedings in the Assembly during the ensuing Session we may be driven to adopt some procedure similar to yours but in that case I would as at present advised do something more striking than simply remaining in the Chamber and looking on while others are carrying on the show.

I am starting for Simla tomorrow morning and hope to hear from you there. I am by no means quite well but hope have been sufficiently patched up by the Calcutta Doctors for the ensuing Session.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

<sup>1</sup> AICC Papers.

<sup>2</sup> N.M. Joshi; b. 1879; labour leader; joined Servants of India Society, 1909, started Bombay Social Service League, 1911 and was its General Secretary till 1953; member, Bombay Municipal Corporation, 1919-23, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1921-47; General Secretary, All India Trade Union Congress, 1925-29, 1940-48; delegate, Round Table Conferences, 1930-32; d. 1955.

Aligarh	Thakur Surajnath Singh <sup>1</sup> Mr. Tassadduq Ahmad Khan Sherwani
Allahabad	Being organised separately on its own footing.
Almora	Pt. Har Govind Pant <sup>2</sup>
Nainital	Pt. Govind Ballabh Pant

As regards the other districts they are at present disorganised and I consider it useless to waste much money over them. I should however like to have your suggestions in the matter. I may mention that Jawaharlal will be glad to help us with his advice and also such work as may be congenial to him. I would therefore request you to write your letters in duplicate sending one copy to me at Simla and the other to Jawaharlal at Allahabad. It is possible that urgent matters may crop up which owing to my pre-occupations at Simla I may not be able to attend to. In such matters Jawaharlal will be of great help. I must make one point quite clear viz. by joining the present M.L.Cs in the organization of Municipal and District Board elections the Provincial Committee and the Central Executive do not waive their right to make the final selection of candidates to be adopted by the Party for the Local Council as well as the Assembly at the next general election. They will not in all cases be bound to adopt the present sitting. (incomplete)

Banda	Thakur Har Prasad Singh <sup>1</sup>
Jhansi	Syt. Atma Ram Govind Kher <sup>2</sup>
	Syt. Bhagwat Narain Bhargava
Jalaun	Pt. Mannilal Pandey <sup>3</sup>
	Pt. Jhannilal Pandey <sup>4</sup>
Cawnpore	Dr. Murarilal
	Dr. Jawaharlal
	Syt. Narain Prasad Arora
	Syt. Ganesh Shanker Vidyarthi
Benares	Babu Sri Prakasa
	Babu Damodar Das <sup>5</sup>
Bijnore	Babu Nemi Saran M.L.C. <sup>6</sup>
Pilibhit	Pt. Brijnandan Prasad Misra <sup>7</sup>
Azamgarh	Maulana Masud Ali Nadvi <sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Thakur Har Prasad Singh; b. 1882; lawyer; belonged to Banda, U.P.; member, U.P. Legislative Council, 1923-29; Chairman, Banda District Board, 1926-30, suffered imprisonment for participating in the national movement, member, U.P. Legislative Assembly, 1937-51; d. 1951.

<sup>2</sup>Atmaram Govind Kher b. 1894; educated at Allahabad and Banaras; participated in the national movement and imprisoned in 1924, 1930, 1932, 1933, 1942, released in 1943 on health grounds; member, A.I.C.C. and U.P.P.C.C. for a number of years, Chairman, Jhansi Municipal Board, 1923-31; member, U.P. Legislative Assembly, 1937-47; Minister for Local Self-Government, U.P., 1947-51; Speaker, U.P. Vidhan Sabha, 1952-62, 1969-74; d. 1982.

<sup>3</sup>Pandit Mannilal Pandey; b. 1892 at Orai, Jalaun district, U.P.; educated at Orai, Gwalior and Allahabad; participated in the Home Rule movement, 1916, member, U.P.P.C.C., 1921; imprisoned during the non-cooperation movement, 1921 and salt satyagraha, 1930; President, Jalaun District Board, 1924; Founder-Editor, *Lokmat*; elected to the U.P. Legislative Assembly in 1937; Director, District Cooperative Bank, Jalaun; d. 1939.

<sup>4</sup>Jhannilal Pandey; b. 1895 at Orai, Jalaun district, U.P.; educated at Orai, Gwalior and Allahabad, member, U.P. Legislative Council, 1923-26; President, Jalaun District Board, 1935-48; associated with various educational institutions; Director, District Cooperative Bank, Jalaun; contributed articles to *Lokmat*; d. 1972.

<sup>5</sup>Damodar Das Shah; b. 1897, belonged to Banaras; elected to the U.P. Legislative Council in 1923, participated in salt satyagraha, 1930 and Quit India movement, 1942; founder-member of Keshi Vidyapith; worked for the cause of women education and Hindu-Muslim unity; d. 1948.

<sup>6</sup>Nemi Saran Jain, b. 1899; member, U.P. Legislative Council, 1923-30; Chief Whip, Swaraj Party, 1926, advocate, Allahabad High Court; member, Bijnor Municipal Board, 1937-40, suffered imprisonment for participating in Congress movements, 1922, 1930, 1940, 1942; member, Provisional Parliament, 1950-52, Lok Sabha, 1952-57, d. 1977.

<sup>7</sup>Pandit Brijnandan Prasad Misra; b. 1890 at Pilibhit, U.P.; educated at Government High School, Pilibhit and Bareilly College, Bareilly; lawyer; attended the Congress sessions at Lucknow, 1916 and Amritsar, 1919, member, U.P. Legislative Council, 1920-29, author of several books; d. 1930.

<sup>8</sup>Maulana Masud Ali Nadvi; b. 1889 at village Bhayara, Barabanki district, U.P.; an active member of the Shibli Academy, Azamgarh, 1915-67; a personal friend of Jawaharlal Nehru, supported the Khilafat movement and the Congress; d. 1967.

the only candidate for the Council of State from the C P who could success fully contest the election with Sir Manekji Dadabhai if Seth Jamnalalji Bajaj agreed to help the Party I met the latter and he has agreed to do his best for Dr Cholkar I find however Seth Jamnadas of Jubbulpore has been announ ced as a candidate by the C P Hindustani I do not know what his chances of success are compared to those of Dr Cholkar But it will never do to have two candidates from the Party for one and same seat Jamnalalji Bajaj has on receipt of a letter from Jamnadasji of Jubbulpore written to me asking for instructions and adding that in his opinion Dr Cholkar has the best chance I am writing to Seth Jamnadas of Jubbulpore to discuss the matter with your self and other workers of the two C P's including Dr Moonje and Seth Jamnalal Bajaj In any case it is for the Executive of the Party in both the sister Provinces to put their heads together and decide finally upon one candi date and support him with their united strength I would rather have Sir Manekji Dadabhai go back to the Council of State than present to the world the unbecoming spectacle of two Swarajists fighting each other Please take early action in this matter before there is any bad blood created between the two Swarajist candidates I am starting for Simla today and shall speak to Seth Govind Das when I meet him there

Let me again offer my congratulations to you for the manly stand on the question of Minister in C P

Yours sincerely  
Motilal Nehru

166 To Kailash Nath Katju<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan  
Allahabad  
16 8 1925

Dear Sir

In am in receipt of your manifesto announcing that you are standing for election to the Council of State I was glad to notice that contrary to the usual practice in India you had taken the trouble to inform your electors of your views on the problems of the day I read your manifesto hoping to find a clear grasp of the situation and definite pronouncements in unambiguous language of how to deal with it I regret to say that I have been greatly disappointed The manifesto abounds in vague generalisations and pious platitudes and there is absolutely nothing in it so far as I can gather to indicate what your views are on controversial issues I imagine that both your rivals in this constituency would willingly sign your manifesto and a voter would have little difficulty in making a choice

164. To Jamnalal Bajaj<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
16th August 1925

Dear Jamnalalji,

Thanks for your letter. Yes I meant Dr. Cholkar<sup>2</sup> and not Dr. Choithram.<sup>3</sup> You are quite right in saying that only one candidate should stand on behalf of the Party. I am writing to Seth Jamnadasji<sup>4</sup> of Jubbulpore, Mr. Raghavendra Rao and Dr. Moonje to act in consultation with you. As for the other candidate from my Province the steps you have already taken will I think be quite enough for the present. I am asking Dr. Kailas Nath to send you the names and addresses of the other voters as I am proceeding to Simla today. I did not hear from Mr. Khatan<sup>5</sup> before leaving Calcutta on my last visit. But I am sure he will do the needful.

Hoping to meet you at Patna during the last week of September.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

165. To E. Raghavendra Rao<sup>6</sup>

Anand Bhawan  
Allahabad  
16th August 1925

Dear Raghavendra Rao,

Dr. Moonje when he met me last in Calcutta told me that Dr. Cholkar was

<sup>1</sup>Seth Jamnalal Bajaj Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Dr. M.R. Cholkar, b. 1882 at Poona; educated at Nagpur, Bombay, Berlin, and London; a follower of Tilak; member, Nagpur Municipal Committee, 1912-25, and its President, 1921-1925; member, A.I.C.C., 1916-24; Secretary, C.P. and Berar P.C.C., 1918-20, Deputy Leader, Congress Medical Mission to China, 1938; Director, Medical Mission to Malaya, 1946; visited China again in 1950; d. 1962.

<sup>3</sup>Chouhram P. Gidwani; b. 1889; Medical Officer, Central Prison, Hyderabad; left government service in 1915; actively participated in all the Congress movements; President, Sind P.C.C., 1920-47, member, A.I.C.C. and Congress Working Committee; Editor, *Hindu* of Hyderabad (Sind), 1922; Chairman, Reception Committee, Congress session, Karachi, 1931, member, Sind Legislative Assembly, 1937-46, Lok Sabha, 1952-57; d. 1957.

<sup>4</sup>Seth Jamnadas; b. 1877; son of Dewan Bahadur Ballabhdas; banker and zamindar; unsuccessfully contested election to the C.P. and Berar Legislative Assembly in 1937; d. 1939.

<sup>5</sup>Debi Prasad Khatan; b. 1888; prominent industrialist; Commissioner, Calcutta Corporation, 1921-24; member, Bengal Legislative Council, 1922-26, Treasurer, Federation of Indian Chamber of Commerce, 1925, and its President, 1930, President, Federation of Indian Chamber of Industry, Bengal Millowners' Association, 1936; member, Bengal Legislative Assembly, 1937-47, General Manager, Birla Brothers Ltd.; director of many sugar and cotton mills; d. 1948.

<sup>6</sup>E. Raghavendra Rao Papers.

verbosity of his brother but not a hundredth part of his intellect. After some general talk we settled our programme for Augt. & Sepr. The last sitting will be on the 12th Sepr. when the Committee will break up to reassemble in Delhi in Novr. when the real enquiry will begin. The last day of the Assembly Session is the 17th Sepr. There will thus be no difficulty about the A.I.C.C. meeting at Patna. Nothing was said about the Committee's trip to Europe and the Dominions but it is expected that a small Sub-Committee will start sometime in March after the evidence in India is recorded.

The Reform debate is probably coming on during the first week of Sepr. Rafi has sent you Mahatmaji's note. I will be glad to have your draft at an early date. Jinnah is at present talking grand but I expect he will cool down gradually to his normal.

The contest for the President's election is going to be keen. So far there is even betting on the field though Rangachari<sup>1</sup> has the solid official & European block and of the 53 Swarajists not more than 45 are expected to attend. This puts Patel at a great disadvantage. It will however be a matter of touch & go. Sarojini is here to help Patel with the Mussalman group. I do not know how she is going to do it with Sir Abdul Qaiyum<sup>2</sup> & Jinnah exerting all their influence against Patel. She is lunching with me today.

I hear Lalaji is very ill at Solon. Some people have gone to see him. I am sorry I cannot leave Simla for a few days.

With love

Your loving  
Father

168. To Jawahar<sup>3</sup>

Hotel Cecil  
Simla  
23.8.25

My dear Jawahar.

Patel was elected in spite of Jinnah, Rangachari and the Govt. block. Jinnah's behaviour was simply disgraceful, even Malaviyaji a personal friend of Rangachari was disgusted & voted with us. It was a great triumph for the Swaraj Party 119 members attended—out of this the Govt. block of 25

<sup>1</sup>Dewan Bahadur T. Rangachari; b. 1865; vakil, Madras High Court, Professor, Madras Law College, 1897-99, entered Madras Corporation in 1907; Secretary, Madras Mahajana Sabha, 1896-99; member, Madras Legislative Council, 1916-19, Railway Finance Committee, 1921, Frontier Committee, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1922-26, 1931-35; Vice-Chairman, Madras Bar Council, d. 1945.

<sup>2</sup>Sir Abdul Qaiyum; b. 1866, civil servant and politician; member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1924-31; member, Sken Committee, 1925; delegate, Round Table Conferences, 1930-31; Vice-President, Muslim League session, Delhi, 1933; member, N.W.F.P. Legislative Council, 1934-37, became Minister in 1935; d. 1937.

<sup>3</sup>Jawaharlal Nehru Papers.

at present engaging public attention. In particular you should make clear whether you belong to any political party or to none. Are you a member of the Swaraj Party? If not do you intend joining it later? Do you agree generally with the programme and policy of the Swaraj Party?

Do you believe in the method of direct action being placed before the country and our preparing the people for it? Do you agree that supplies should not be voted so long as our demands are not acceded to?

Do you believe in the *Khaddar* programme of the Congress? Are you prepared to do your utmost to promote handspinning and *Khaddar*?

These are only a very few random questions jotted down in a hurry. Many other similar questions will doubtless suggest themselves to you. I trust you will take the earliest opportunity of making your position clear.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

167. To Jawahar<sup>1</sup>

Hotel Cecil  
Simla  
19.8.25

My dear Jawahar,

I have at last found a cosy little suite of rooms in the Cecil and am quite comfortable. Rafi is chumming with Shamji at Rs 5/- a day. Upadhiya has found room as usual under the furniture of the sitting room.

So far Simla has treated me kindly. Indeed I feel better.

I attended the Skeen Committee<sup>2</sup> yesterday. The President & the Secretary are just the blunt soldiers I expected them to be. Ziauddin<sup>3</sup> needs no description, the others barring Jinnah & Ram Chandra Rao<sup>4</sup> are mere sheep including Capt. Banerji<sup>5</sup> brother of the late Surendra Nath Banerji. He has some of the

<sup>1</sup>Jawaharlal Nehru Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Skeen Committee, Indian Sandhurst Committee under the Chairmanship of Andrew Skeen was constituted on 2 July 1925 as per recommendation of the Indian Legislative Assembly resolution adopted on 16 February 1925 to investigate and report on the question of establishing a Military College in India to train Indian officers for the commissioned rank of Indian Army.

<sup>3</sup>Dr. Ziauddin Ahmed; b. 1878, member, Sadler Commission, 1917-24, Skeen Committee, 1925, U.P. Legislative Council, 1924-26, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1931-35 and 1946, Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University, 1935-47; d. 1947.

<sup>4</sup>Dewan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao, b. 1868, advocate, Madras High Court; member, Madras Legislative Council, 1910-23, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1924-26, Skeen Committee, 1925; delegate, Round Table Conferences, 1930 and 1931; Director, Reserve Bank of India, 1935; d. 1936.

<sup>5</sup>Jitendranath Bandyopadhyay; b. 1860, Bar-at-law, Calcutta High Court, Lecturer, Ripon College, Calcutta; received Durbar Medal, 1912 and Volunteer Long Service Medal and War Badge during the First World War; President, Governing Body of Ripon College, 1925, member, Skeen Committee, 1925, Founder, All Bengal Physical Culture Association, 1927; d. 1935.

*The Servant from Arrah.* I do not remember who he is. Both Bhola & Abul Hassan were with me at Arrah and he could not have served me as a personal servant. He is perhaps a *punkha* coolie who struck me at the time as clever enough for a better job and I might have asked him if he was willing to go to Allahabad. I have no need for an additional man servant on full pay as Hari is quite satisfactory. Only his hours are as irregular as mine & some times I need some one during his absence to do odd jobs. For this a small boy would be enough. If you like the man from Arrah and think he will supply a real want in the household you may engage him.

*The Note from some Indian Commissioned Officer.* The information he has given will come in very handy in the course of the enquiry the Skeen Committee is holding. It will serve no useful purpose to have any questions put in the Assembly as the answer is sure to be that the Skeen Committee has been appointed to investigate these very matters. The Govt. will not admit the facts as given in the paper sent to me and by putting its own garbled version on the proceedings deprive us of the opportunity to discuss the matter with the European members in an unbiased spirit. The questions in the Assembly are sure to pat up the backs of the latter. I have suggested & the suggestion has been accepted that all Indian officers who have secured King's Commission & all those who have either failed to do so or having secured it had to give it up for any cause whatsoever should be examined by us as witnesses. The note will be useful when these witnesses come up. (incomplete)

170. To Jawahar<sup>1</sup>

Hotel Cecil  
Simla  
2.9.25

My dear Jawahar,

I have sent you three letters during the last few days. They were probably received after you wrote your last complaining of absence of all news from me. I am doing very well so far and Simla seems to be agreeing with me. I am having my evening walks, a good appetite and fairly good sleep.

I am glad that the play in which Betty and Indu were taking part has come off and only hope that the excitement of a whole month or more will not be followed by undesirable reaction.

I have done my part in the matter of electrifying IA Church Road by authorising Joseph to do the needful. He undertook to make the necessary application & do the wiring etc. I informed Dhantyagi of this and he said that was enough for me & that he would see to the rest.

I am wiring to the Tatas to expedite the iron rods. How far has the construction proceeded? Our engineer is too busy with other jobs to send me the weekly reports of progress he promised. What about the boring of the well?



plus the 9 Europeans and 12 nominated members voted solidly for Rangachari & Jinnah with all his efforts could not muster more than 9 votes from the Indian elected members. This makes 55 but Rangachari was given the benefit of one doubtful vote [which] was really Patel's thus bringing up the total to 56. There were no less than 9 absentees from among the Swarajists & their voting strength was reduced to 44. Two of Patel's votes were declared invalid—the remaining 14 came from the other elected members including 2 nominated. A round of entertainments began last night and will continue for some days to come.

I am doing very well so far. The weather is fine and quite enjoyable. Dalhousie was at least 10 degrees cooler when we were there.

I am summoning a meeting of the General Council of the S.P. at Patna for the 23rd Sept. The 22nd is all right for the A.I.C.C.

Hope it is all well at Anand Bhawan.

Your loving  
Father

You will be amused to hear that Patel's Presidential gown is being made out of Sarojini's saree.

I have just finished my letter to Betty & am enclosing it to be handed to her after you have read it.

169. To Jawahar<sup>1</sup>

Hotel Cecil  
Simla  
29.8.1925

My dear Jawahar,

I have had a most strenuous week & am full up even today (Saturday). The Assembly, Party meetings, and the Sken Committee have kept me occupied from 10 a.m. to 8 p.m. almost daily. The Sken Committee is again meeting at 10 today. I am writing a few lines in haste to reply to some of the questions you have asked me.

Nabha. The Maharaja<sup>2</sup> has written to me also asking me to see him for a few hours as soon as possible. I am writing to tell him that I can only see him after the Assembly Session when I intend to inspect the Military College at Dehra Dun. You had better leave him to me. Having once burnt your fingers over Nabha I do not wish you to take any more risks. My information is that the man is off his head now.

Cool. I think his services may be retained till I return.

<sup>1</sup>Jawaharlal Nehru Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Maharaja Ripudaman Singh of Nabha; b. 1883, educated privately; member, Viceroy's Council, 1906-08; succeeded his father in 1911; abdicated in favour of his minor son, Pratap Singh, 1923, deprived of the title of Maharaja, 1928; d. 1942.

ved by me as the best we could have out of the bigger Committee. I do hope that Dr. Ziauddin and Capt. Hira Singh<sup>1</sup> will never know that their exclusion is due to me. Abdul Qaiyum with all his communal leanings is at least a gentleman & Major Zorawar Singhji is a fine type of Rajput soldier very well educated and thoroughly independent. He is a friend of Ranjit & has presented a fine Kathiawad mare to Nan. He was introduced to me at Juhu by Ranjit. I do not remember if you were there. He has only recently been taken on the Skeen Committee & from the very first day supported the Indian view and took the attitude adopted by Jinnah & myself. He held a King's Commission and threw it up in disgust. From this alone you can imagine how valuable a colleague he will prove to Jinnah & me. Pheroze Sethna is not quite the right sort but will not have the courage to desert us. I had suggested Ramchandra Rao in his place but they wanted a Parsi and I did not think it worthwhile to press my choice.

What is most gratifying to me is that Ranjit and Nan are thinking of going to Europe about the same time. I have written to Nan to cancel their passage if they have already taken it and leave it to me to arrange it by the same boat by which we are leaving. I am to preside over the Sub-Committee and Major Lumby will be under me. I think I can without any sacrifice of principle ask him to arrange for passages which will be paid for & also secure accommodation for Ranjit & Nan in the hotels in which we are to be put up.

I hope the deluge you have had in Allahabad has not damaged the new building.

I had my first outing in Simla yesterday & thoroughly enjoyed it. We went to Mahasu & had our tea at the Wild Flower Hall

I am glad Dr. Mullik<sup>2</sup> has impressed you so favourably and hope his treatment will benefit Kamla

Mohammad Ali has come here to work for Nabha! He had a long talk with me but was soon satisfied that I could not without compromising myself help him in his errand. He is now tackling Fazli Hosain.<sup>3</sup>

The list of bills paid by you only serves to remind me of our precarious finances I only hope you will not be called upon to spend the whole of Kamla's money on miscellaneous items.

Ranjit and Nan definitely decided to give up their Simla visit some time ago. They have probably left for some sea side place by now.

The organization of the Province for the M. & D. Board elections is becoming more & more complicated by reason of Gauri Shanker, Khalique & others fighting among themselves. I have no time to attend to their quarrels & will sit tight before I come back to Allahabad. I have now received a requisition for Rs 10,000/- but am not going to pay even Rs 10/- in the present state of things.

I have just received the reply of the Maharaja of Nabha to my letter. He wants me to send someone on whom I can thoroughly rely at once to take his message to me before the close of the Assembly Session, I shall see what I can do.

I have just finished my draft of the Reform Resolution. It is being typed. I shall send you a copy tomorrow.

With love to all

Your loving  
Father

171. To Jawahar<sup>1</sup>

Hotel Cecil  
Simla  
14.9.25

My dear Jawahar,

Before the Skeen Committee broke up on Saturday last the President announced that a Sub-Committee consisting of Jinnah, Pheroze Sethna,<sup>2</sup> Abdul Qaiyum, Major Zorawar Singh<sup>3</sup> and myself with Major Lumby as Secretary will proceed to Europe at the end of March or the beginning of April. The tour will comprise England, France, and Canada and will take three months. We are expected to be back by the end of June or the beginning of July in good time for the next general elections. I said nothing about having a Secretary to myself as in the first place I did not like asking for anything special and in the second I thought it would not be fair to the other members. As I have perhaps already told you I was previously consulted about the constitution of the Sub-Committee and that appointed was appro-

<sup>1</sup>Jawaharlal Nehru Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Sr Pheroze Sethna; b. 1866, eminent businessman and a Liberal leader of Bombay; member, Council of State, 1921-38, Skeen Committee, 1925, delegate, Round Table Conferences, 1930-32 and was the only Parsee delegate from British India to the Joint Parliamentary Committee; d. 1938.

<sup>3</sup>Major Thakur Zorawar Singh; M.C. Chief Secretary, Council of Administration, Bhavnagar State; represented Indian States on the Skeen Committee.

*Correspondence*

tion and added that I was making it off hand and might on fuller consideration change my mind. It is therefore not right to draw any inferences from it much less to think that it had any bioding effect on anybody. I would ask you in considering my present suggestion to dismiss from your mind all that passed between me and the then Home Member. It will be a question for us to consider later how the Tikka Sahab's case is to be put and what relief is to be asked for. This is a matter which can only be settled after consultation with you and the Maharani Saheba. For the present the only point I desire to impress upon you is that it is the case of Tikka Sahab alone which stands a reasonable chance of success. If you agree on this preliminary point I shall be glad to enter into further details either by correspondence or a personal visit.

As at present advised I intend to stay at Allahabad for about a fortnight to get through the professional work which has been accumulating for some-time past. About the middle of October I shall start on a political tour in which it will be possible to include Dehra Dun. If, however, you agree to adopt the course I have suggested I may be able to find time for a visit to Dehra Dun at an earlier date.

There is no question of any terms until we have agreed on the line of action to be adopted but I have given a general idea to your brother-in-law.

With kind regards.

Yours sincerely  
Motilal Nebru

173. To M.R. Jayakar<sup>1</sup>

29th Sept. 1925

My dear Jayakar,

I am sorry I have not been able to write to you for a very long time. It is only for the last two or three days that the high pressure under which I have been working all this time has been relaxed.

Kelkar has definitely decided to remain in the Assembly and recommended Chitale<sup>2</sup> to be set up on behalf of the Swaraj Party for the Council of State. So you have to wait for the general election. I am not at all sorry that this is so as in all probability we are going to have some striking demonstration in the Assembly and the Provincial Councils on the announcement of the final decision of the Government on the Reforms Resolution. The exact form of this demonstration will of course be settled later on in consultation with the

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers.

<sup>2</sup>G K. Chitale; b. 1868; lawyer; joined Ahmednagar Bar, 1897. Secretary, Ahmednagar Education Society, 1900-20 and President, 1922-43; President, Ahmednagar Municipality, 1903-18, Founder-Principal and Chairman, Nagar District Urban Central Cooperative Bank Ltd., 1910-30 and 1942-43; President, District Local Board, Ahmednagar, 1915-27; member, Bombay Legislative Council, 1919-39, nominated Speaker in 1930; Editor, *Sherakar*, a weekly, 1920; President, Ahmednagar Bar Association, 1920-42; President, Hind Seva Mandal, 1920-43, first Director, Maharashtra Sugar Mills Ltd., 1934-40; d. 1943.

You have said nothing about Indu. I hope she is quite fit.  
With love

Your loving  
Father

172. *To Maharaja of Nabha*<sup>1</sup>

26th September 1925

Dear Maharaja Sahab,

The letter you addressed to me at Patna was handed to me by Maulana Mohamed Ali. I had a talk with him about your proposal to move a resolution at the meeting of the All India Congress Committee. Mahatmaji was very busy and we could not get an opportunity to speak to him on the subject. I was not quite clear in my own mind as to what the terms of the resolution should be and Maulana Sahab was unable to suggest any. The matter could not therefore be brought up before the meeting.

I have had a long talk with your brother-in-law who arrived this afternoon with your letter of the 24th September and have fully explained to him the view I take of your case. He will no doubt be able to give you a fair idea of the conversation with me. It is only necessary for me to say that after a very careful and anxious consideration of all the circumstances it is my settled opinion that it will be futile to press for your reinstatement or compensation for the wrong done to you. There is no human probability of the Government agreeing to go behind the main findings of the Commission of Enquiry. It is obvious that there can be no question of reinstatement or compensation unless the Government can be made to admit that it has done you an injustice. This you know as well as I do that the Government will never admit under any circumstances whatever. As practical men therefore we should divert our attention and energy into a course which is more likely to lead to substantial results. That course in my opinion is to seek the redress of the wrong in the name and for the benefit of Tikka Sahab<sup>2</sup> under the guardianship of the Maharani Sahiba. The Government will in that case be confronted with the irresistible claim of two admittedly innocent persons both deeply interested in the preservation of the State and neither responsible for any thing true or false that has been laid at your door.

The conversation I had with the present Governor of the Punjab when he was Home Member to the Government of India was an informal one and the suggestion I made to him was entirely my own which occurred to me on the spur of the moment. In fact, I took care to say so before I made the sugges-

<sup>1</sup>*Motilal Nehru Papers.*

<sup>2</sup>Pratap Singh, b. 1919 at Mussoorie; received early education at Woodstock School, Mussoorie; later went to England and studied at Badingham College, Leatherhead, Surrey and Royal Military College, Sandhurst; became Raja in 1941; Knighted, 1946, ADC to the President of India.

in *Khaddar* but I believe as fully in other things also which distinguish the Swarajist from the pure Gandhite. The great achievement at Patna was to bring the Congress into its own as the national political organisation and it is up to us all to devote our energies to evolve a workable political programme to be adopted at the Cawnpore Congress. I should very much like you to take this into your serious consideration and prepare a draft programme of the political work for the next year.

I expect a long letter from you in reply dealing with all the points I have referred to above.

Yours sincerely  
(Motilal Nehru)

174. To Lalji Naranji<sup>1</sup>

30th Sept. 1925

Dear Mr. Lalji Naranji.

I have not heard from you since we met last in Simla and do not know what progress, if any, has been made in making up Bombay's quota. You will be surprised to hear that Mr. Kasturbhai held back Rs 10000/- on the sole plea that Ahmedabad had already exceeded the proportion due on the payments made by Bombay. This shows what faith Ahmedabad has in Bombay's promises to the Party.

What about the European gentleman who came with you to Simla and promised a handsome contribution.

Our responsibilities have been increased since the Patna meeting and we have now to run the Congress and not merely the Swaraj Party. There are practically no Congress funds available to us as they are mostly earmarked for Khadi. We are therefore in greater need of money than we have ever been.

I have written to Mr. Jayakar about your offer to find him the necessary funds as soon as an opportunity offers itself either to acquire an existing paper or to start one. I expect he has talked to you on the subject.

Expecting an early reply.

Yours sincerely  
(Motilal Nehru)

principal workers and will have to be formally sanctioned by the Congress which is now entirely in our hands.

What about the other candidates for the Council of State from the Bombay side Kelkar assures me that Chitale who has now fully adopted the Swaraj creed and programme has the best chance and Patel told me at Simla that it would be possible to capture another seat. I do hope that in this matter you will be able to act in concert with Patel and Jamnadas. I was told at Simla that some difficulty had again arisen in connection with the Corporation elections but that it had been got over. I trust all parties concerned will agree on good Swarajist candidates and the work will go on smoothly. I have a mind to visit Bombay during the latter half of October to settle a number of outstanding questions. Meanwhile I wish you and Patel to make up your minds about the second Swarajist candidate from Bombay for the Council of State and let me know as early as possible. Kelkar is anxious to have an early official announcement adopting Chitale. If another candidate with a fair chance of success is forthcoming I would like to announce the two together. I am also waiting for information from other Provinces.

I had a talk with Lalji Naranji in Simla about the contributions to the Party funds from Bombay and also about a special fund for a newspaper in Bombay. As to the former Mr. Lalji promised to see that the old standing promises were redeemed as soon as possible and as to the latter he said that there would be no difficulty in getting up a special subscription for a Bombay Swarajist paper as soon as you were ready either to acquire an existing paper or to start a new one. Please talk over the matter with him and let me know if you have any plans for early execution.

I am trying my best to start a weekly in Allahabad by the middle of October. As it is not necessary for that purpose to begin with a press of our own and the New Journal Press here has undertaken to do the printing and despatch etc. for us the only thing wanting is a competent editorial staff. Your young friend Mr. Madho Rao is well known to Jawaharlal and I have been able to get a fair idea of his style in writing from the cuttings supplied by him. We think he will do very well as a contributor to the literary section of the paper. It is necessary to have a more experienced man as an editor and as at present advised I am going to try one Mr. Ramseshan also a Madras who has been well spoken of. He has been asked to come up for personal interview. I think a short conversation with him on various topics will reveal his capacity more clearly than second and third hand accounts received from others. We have enough men in the U.P. to take up the duties of an assistant or a sub-editor and I do not think I should go out of my way to get a man from Madras. I propose therefore to arrange with Mr. Madho Rao regular contributions on literary subjects. These he can send for publication from Madras or any other place.

I hope you are satisfied with the net result of the proceedings held in Patna last week. I know your weakness against *Khadhar* but you could hardly expect it to be eliminated altogether specially when all India except Maharashtra still swears by it. A distinct advance has however been made from even your point of view by deleting the *Khadhar* clause from the franchise and relegating it to the category of general rules. As you know I am a full believer

Meanwhile please let me know the full address of Ibrahim Cureembhoy<sup>1</sup>, the nephew of Sir Fuzulbhoy Cureembhoy. I do not wish to write to him care of his uncle.

Please let me know all about yourself.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

177. To T. Prakasam<sup>2</sup>

1st October 1925

Dear Prakasam<sup>3</sup>

I have been thinking over the short conversation we had just before we parted at Patna. The understanding we arrived at will I hope prove quite satisfactory on both sides if it is worked in the proper spirit. Shortly it comes to this that I wish the *Swarajya* to be henceforth thoroughly identified with the Swaraj Party which is now practically the same as the Congress. But as I explained in my speech at Patna the identity of the Party has to be maintained whatever its strength in the Congress. There must always be some disgruntled no-changers seeking for an opportunity to discredit the Swarajists and their work. Neither the Swaraj Party nor its organ can be perfect. Both are human institutions and liable to human errors. I expect however that any error committed by either will be bonafide and it will be the business of the Party organ to defend it against the criticism of a hostile Press. There is all the difference in the world in interpreting the action of the Party in the most favourable light consistent with truth and fairness and looking upon the same action with a prejudiced mind and a predetermination to discover in it something wrong or discreditable. The former is the function of the Party organ and the latter the only refuge for the hostile critics. In cases of doubt or difficulty it will always be open to you to refer to me or some other responsible member of the Party nearer home and suspend judgment till you have had a full explanation. This I expect will always be found satisfactory. I hope you will agree in this short description of the special features of a Party organ.

I have been troubled since my return from Patna with the financial position of the *Swarajya*. You were saying something about it when our friend Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar interposed and our conversation was cut short. It is

<sup>1</sup>Ibrahim G. Currimbhoy, b. 1898; millowner; Managing Director, Currimbhoy Group of Mills; member of delegations of various chambers to international conferences; d. 1970.

<sup>2</sup>*AICC Papers*

<sup>3</sup>T. Prakasam, b. 1872; member, Rajahmundry Municipality, 1900, and Chairman, 1903; leading lawyer of Madras High Court, 1907-1920; President, Andhra P.C.C. and member, A.L.C.C., 1922, editor, *Swarajya*, 1924-33; member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1925-30; started a weekly, *Village Republic* (in Telugu and Tamil), 1940; became Revenue Minister, Madras Government in 1937, Premier, Madras, 1946-47; took part in the agitation for a separate Telugu state; became Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh in 1953; d. 1957.



175 To Purshotamdas Thakurdas<sup>1</sup>

30th September 1925

Dear Sir Purshotamdas,

I hope you have survived the excitement of the public reception given to the first citizen and Lord Mayor of India.

What do you think of the recent effusion of your learned leader in the Press. I was charitable enough to draw a veil on his own weakness and that of his Party and suggested an excuse for him to get out of the resignation. He has repaid me for this by a caustic statement in the Press. I do not know how he would have felt if I had divulged the true reason why the resignations did not materialise though he was aware that I knew it then as well as he did because the letters addressed to him by his Musalman followers were written after consultation with me. However I am not going to take any notice of his public declarations and am for the present confining myself to a very friendly correspondence with him which is now going on.

We have been handed over the charge of the Congress with practically empty coffers but we have gladly accepted the responsibility and I hope we shall discharge it to the satisfaction of the public.

I wonder if Mr. Manmohandas Ramji has kept his word. The closing of the mills in quick succession cannot affect the promises. On the contrary I gather from what was stated to me at Simla that so far as the millowners were concerned the closing down will save the losses they were incurring and put them in a better position to fulfil their engagements. It is the poor mill hands who have to suffer. May I therefore expect Sir Fuzulbhoy to come up to the scratch?

I find it will be necessary for me to visit Bombay sometime at the end of October or beginning of November to put the Congress organizations on a satisfactory footing. I am not yet in a position to fix up my programme but will let you know in good time. Have you any intention of leaving Bombay for any length of time during October and November?

Yours sincerely  
(Motilal Nehru)

176. To Kantilal Parekh<sup>2</sup>

Anand Bhawan  
Allahabad  
30th Sept. 1925

My dear Kantilal,

I expected to meet you at Patna but there was no trace of you. What are you doing with yourself? I am thinking of going to Bombay sometime in October but am not sure of the exact date. I shall let you know in good time.

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).

<sup>2</sup>Motilal Nehru Papers.

the 27th September. It is very amusing to me to see that you are fighting shy of the Swaraj Party while you believe in its policy and programme and take the Independents to task for not having the courage to go the whole hog with us. However it is a matter of great satisfaction to me to find that you are attached to me personally with the same loving regard as before.

The Independents are now backing out one by one as I had fully anticipated. I never expected them to stand by such a high and mighty resolve as their leader in a moment of excitement called upon them to make. I want all my friends to sign the resignations only to show the difference between the Independent mentality and ours. Your authority to me is quite enough. You need not bother yourself any further.

I am going to write to you again in the course of a day or two about the Council of State elections. We are meeting on Sunday to consider the question and I shall let you know the final decision of the Party.

Yours affectionately,  
(Motilal Nehru)

180. To C. Vijayaraghavachariar<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
4.10.1925

Dear Mr. Vijayaraghavachariar,

I was delighted to receive a letter from you after a very long time and to be assured that you had all this time preserved a soft corner in your heart for me. I am sorry however to find myself unable to comply with the very small request you have made. I am on principle opposed to the multiplication of shrines, temples, mosques and other places of worship. I think we have enough of them and to spare for ages to come. Whatever religious merit may attach to the erection of new shrines it is more than counterbalanced by the perpetuation of communal discord. There is only one goddess that I worship and that is the Goddess of Swaraj and it is a patent fact that shrines dedicated to other gods and goddesses are effectively preventing the installation of my *Ishtdevi*.

There is however one condition on which I shall gladly contribute my humble mite and ask my friends to contribute theirs. It is this. The promoters of this movement should agree that all classes of Hindus including non-Brahmans and depressed classes on the lowest rung of the Hindu social ladder will be freely admitted without any distinction into the innermost sanctum sanctorum of the newly discovered image of Shri Ramji.

I hope you will agree that this is the only means of clearing the way for Swaraj.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely  
Motilal Nehru

obvious that the paper must be kept alive in the interest of the Party which I take to be identical with the interest of the country and it is certainly the business of the Party to help its organ when in financial difficulties. But the trouble is that strictly speaking there are no Party funds available and the collections made by me in Bombay will not go a long way to meet the expenditure which awaits us in the near future. I feel however that it is only fair that some contribution however small should be made immediately if it is urgently needed. Will you kindly give me an idea of your immediate requirements so that I may consider how far it is possible for me to relieve the (incomplete)

178. To T.H. Thorne<sup>1</sup>

1.10.1925

Dear Mr. Thorne<sup>2</sup>,

I owe you many apologies for having overlooked your letter of the 17th August which was received in Simla when I was very busy. I have only just settled down after the storm and stress of the Assembly and Patna to clear the arrears of my correspondence and other work.

I heard so much about you from the late Deshbandhu and after his death from my friend Mr. J.M. Sen Gupta that I am looking forward to the pleasure of meeting you as early as possible. I am not at all sure when I shall next find myself at Calcutta as you know I am not my own master but a slave of circumstances which can drag me to any place far and near at the shortest notice. It will give me great pleasure indeed to see you when I visit Calcutta next, and you may be sure that I will make a point of doing so.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely  
(Motilal Nehru)

T H Thorne Esq.,  
13, Hazra Mansions,  
Calcutta.

179 To Mohammad Ismail Khan<sup>3</sup>

2nd October 1925

My dear Ismail<sup>4</sup>,

I was very glad to read the sentiments expressed by you in your letter of

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).

<sup>2</sup>T H Thorne; Manager of *The Planters Journal and Agriculturist*

<sup>3</sup>AICC Papers

<sup>4</sup>Mohammad Ismail Khan; b. 1886; Muslim leader from Meerut, Bar-at-law; member, All India Muslim League, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1923-30, Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University, 1934-35, 1947-48; elected to the U.P. Legislative Assembly in 1937; member, Constituent Assembly, 1946-50, Provisional Parliament, 1950-52, d. 1958.

Patel, Jamnadas and Kelkar. The last named seems to think that the nomination of 2 Swarajists will jeopardise the return of both. Chitale will of course be a great acquisition and we cannot sacrifice to the off chance of having 2 Swarajists.

As regards a Swarajist daily for Bombay I wish you would tackle Lotwala<sup>1</sup>, either independently or through Patel to either sell or lease out the *Advocate of India's*<sup>2</sup> machinery etc. to us. I am told that it is up-to-date machinery and more than enough for the requirements of a daily.

The general election is approaching fast and we cannot afford to remain without a Swarajist daily in Bombay much longer. I hope Mr. Lalji Naranji will come up to the scratch if you are ready with a definite proposal.

I am starting a Swarajist Weekly from Allahabad early in November. Besides expounding the Swarajist policy and programme and giving Swarajist news I wish this Weekly to have articles of general as well as of special interest to the ordinary newspaper reader. For this purpose I require one political letter a week from each Province and from Bombay also a special article weekly on commerce, industry, finance and other allied topics. Please suggest the names of suitable contributors who will be prepared to write readable articles for reasonable honoraria. I propose to call the paper the *Onward* to establish a sort of a family relation with the *Forward* which is at present the only avowed Swarajist daily in India.

I am writing to Patel about Lotwala and Durbar Gopal Das.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

183. To Seth Govind Das<sup>3</sup>

Anand Bhawan  
Allahabad  
13th Oct. 1925

Dear Govinddas,

Thanks for your taking prompt steps to call the meeting of your Provincial

<sup>1</sup>Ranchoddas Bhawan Lotwala; b [1875] in Bombay; educated in Bombay; matriculation, 1893, inherited his father's business, 1894, established Duncan Road Flour Mill, President, Depressed Classes League; helped to found and develop the Provincial Arya Pratinidhi Sabha, member, Board of Trustees, Bombay Arya Samaj and later its Vice-President; Editor, *Arya Prakash*, 1904, started a Gujarati daily, *Akhbar-i-Soudagar* in 1913, renamed it *Hindusthan* after sometime and then *Hindusthan Prajambh* in 1926 when he bought the rights of another paper, *Prajambh* from the Tatas; Trustee, Jetha Premji Trust; associated with the Home Rule movement of Annie Besant; helped to found and maintain Indian Irish Independence League, 1932-33, Founder-President, Libertarian Society; his date: d. 1971

<sup>2</sup>*Advocate of India* was an evening paper started in 1896 by Thomas Blancy. Ranchoddas Lotwala purchased it, but soon had to close it down.

<sup>3</sup>*Seth Govind Das Papers*.

181. To Kantilal Parekh<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan  
Allahabad  
8th October 1925

Dear Kantilal,

I am sorry to learn from your letter that you have been keeping bad health. I hope the change to Umreth will do you good. Please do not disturb your programme for my sake as I cannot be sure of the date of my arrival in Bombay.

Thanks, I am quite alright now and have nearly regained the weight that I had lost

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

182. To M.R. Jayakar<sup>2</sup>

12.10.1925

My dear Jayakar,

Your letter of the 7th October.

I hope you will get this letter on your return from Sindh and before you leave for Poona.

I am calling a meeting of the Executive Committee of the General Council at Nagpur on the 1st November along with a joint meeting of the Provincial Committees of Berar and 2 C.P.s to deal with Tambe's<sup>3</sup> defection, the question of Ministership and other difficulties which have arisen in the C.P. Council. I do not know if you will be able to get away from your Council by that time but I dare not postpone the Nagpur meeting as the C.P. Government is contemplating to hold a meeting of the Council early in November and seduce some more of our men into Ministership etc. After the Nagpur meeting I am hoping to run down to Bombay for a few days.

I wish you would discuss the candidature of Durbar Gopal Das<sup>4</sup> with

<sup>1</sup>Motilal Nehru Papers.

<sup>2</sup>AICC Papers.

<sup>3</sup>S.B. Tambe, b. 1875, pleader; member and Vice-President, Amraoti Town Municipal Committee, President, C.P. and Berar P.C.C.; member, C.P. and Berar Legislative Council, 1917-20, re-elected in 1924; President, C.P. and Berar Legislative Council, 1925, member, Governor's Executive Council, C.P. and Berar, 1925-31; Acting Governor, C.P. and Berar, 1929; member, Indian Franchise Committee, 1932, d. 1958.

<sup>4</sup>Darbar Gopal Das Kashibhai Desai; b. 1887; a follower of Mahatma Gandhi; his nationalist activities led to the loss of his state in 1922; participated in Borsad satyagraha, 1923, Bardoli satyagraha, 1928, salt satyagraha, 1930, individual satyagraha and Quit India movement, 1941-42, Chairman, Reception Committee, Harijans Congress, 1938, took part in States' people's movement in Gujarat; was given back his state in 1946, but he handed it over to the Government of free India; d. 1951.

Government. It is open to you while categorically denying the truth of the charges laid against you and acting in your capacity as the present Ruling Chief of Nabha to accelerate the succession of Tikka Sahab to the Gaddi and then fight for him and in his name. After all is said and done you cannot possibly start with a clean slate as the Tikka Sahab can. This is a point upon which I cannot stress too much and indeed is the essential condition for my taking up the case and also for any possible action on behalf of either the Congress or the Swaraj Party. The old story is now worn out threadbare. What is needed is a fresh starting point. This can be made available by following a procedure which can only be finally determined after consultation with you.

I do not think you will receive any reply to the representation you made to the Home Member. It is absolutely useless to expect anything from that quarter under existing circumstances.

I am sorry I shall have no time to visit Dehra Dun at an early date. I am leaving for Sitapur on the 17th for the Provincial Conference and have to return to Allahabad on the 22nd after taking Lucknow and Cawnpore on the way back. I shall then have to go to Benares and pass on to the Central Provinces and Bombay. I have to be at Nagpur on the 1st November but have not yet fixed the date of my departure from Allahabad on return from Sitapur, Lucknow and Cawnpore. It may be possible to squeeze in Dehra Dun between Benares and Nagpur if you specially want me. The regular tour which I propose to make in that part of the Province has for the present been postponed *sine die*.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

H.H. Maharaja Ripudaman Singh Sahab.  
Dehra Dun

185 To C.S. Ranga Iyer<sup>1</sup>

To  
C S. Ranga Iyer, Esq., M.L.A.,  
Member of the Swaraj Party,  
Talbot House,  
Simla.

Allahabad, 15th Oct. 1925

Mr. C.S. Ranga Iyer, M.L.A. is hereby called upon to show cause to the satisfaction of the Executive of the General Council of the Swaraj Party a meeting of which will be held at Nagpur on Sunday the 1st November why disciplinary action should not be taken against him with reference to the

Committee at Nagpur on the first November. I am looking forward to your company from Jubbulpore to Nagpur in the motor journey which I usually have when I go to Nagpur.

You were mentioning to me at Simla about the money advanced by you to the Swaraj Party in the early days of its existence. I remember to have told you then that it will be taken as your contribution but I did not seriously mean to convert a loan into a gift. You are quite at liberty to contribute what you like but it is the duty of the drawer to honour his draft. Please therefore send me a copy of your account and I shall remit to you the amount due to you.

Tambe must be severely dealt with and the office hunting propensities of the C. P. Councillors must be effectively stopped. I hope the members of the three allied Provincial Committees are perfectly sound and there is no danger of their voting for acceptance of office whether that of Councillor or Minister. Please whip up those whom you believe to be quite *pucca*.

Berar has agreed to have the meeting at Nagpur on the 1st and so have you and Raghavendra Rao. Abhyankar however has taken four days time to consider. I do not know why. If it is only a question of date there will be no difficulty in changing it. I shall wire the final decision.

The Council of State candidature of a Swarajist has now been definitely given up in accordance with the advice given by you and Mr. R. Shukla at Simla. It is a great pity but cannot be helped.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

184. To Maharaja Ripudaman Singh<sup>1</sup>

14th October 1925

Dear Maharaja Sahab,

I have received your letter of the 7th October and carefully considered the contents.

You have devoted several pages of your letter to the question of your abdication and have made out a strong case against its being considered voluntary. As you are aware I have myself always entertained that view and it was in the full belief that you were not a free agent when you signed the so-called abdication that I gave you the advice contained in my letter of the 26th September. After again giving the matter my most careful consideration I adhere to that advice and am of opinion that you will gain nothing by resting your case on the personal wrong done to you. The only practical course to adopt is to proceed on the lines I have already suggested and start the case more in the interest of the State and Tikka Sahab. I do not by this mean that you are to accept in any way the position assigned to you by Lord Reading's

and my speech at Sitapur on Kelkar's interview was based on the telegraphic summaries published in the Allahabad papers. A study of the full text of the interviews received today reveals a much more painful state of things than what I had imagined on seeing the telegraphic summaries.

You said in your letter that you were going to speak out your mind freely in the course of the interview which was then to come. Whether it was right for you to speak at all on the matters on which you have now spoken is a debatable point. But my right as the President of the All India Swaraj Party to speak freely on all occasions and on all matters affecting the Party cannot be doubted. It was impossible for me to keep quiet after you and Kelkar had both ridiculed and held up to public contempt the Party to which both of you belong and over which I have the honour to preside. I see a brief note in today's papers to the effect that in a further statement to the Press you have very properly declined to enter into an "acrimonious controversy" with me. This wise decision will at least serve to prevent an already complicated situation from being worse complicated.

The question now is what is to be done having regard to what has already taken place. The matter can hardly be allowed to rest where it is. There is as far as I can see only one of two alternatives open to us, viz. either to adjust our differences and arrive at an understanding on clear and definite lines for our future work or to part company. Nothing will please me more than to adopt the first alternative if it is possible to do so. If not, the other alternative is inevitable.

The meeting of the Executive Committee of the General Council has been called at Nagpur on the 1st November to consider the case of Mr. Tambe and other matters relating to the C.P. Council such for instance as the acceptance of ministerships and generally the future attitude of the Swarajists in the C.P. Council. The situation created by the interviews given by you and Kelkar can hardly be properly dealt with by the Executive Committee of which both you and Kelkar are members. Should it unfortunately become necessary to take regular and constitutional action in the matter the only proper authority to take such action satisfactorily is in my opinion the full General Council of the Party. The meeting of the Executive Committee at Nagpur can however be utilised to explore avenues for the adoption of the first of the two alternatives I have mentioned above. I would therefore ask you to make a special effort to attend the Nagpur meeting. The present session of your Council will probably be over by that time but even if it is not I hope you will find a way to attend the far more important meeting at Nagpur.

One thing is perfectly clear and that is that there should be no room left for a repetition of the regrettable incidents that have happened and the sooner the necessary action is taken the better.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru



following statement which he is reported to have made to the Press:—

"It is a brilliant stroke of Sir Montagu Butler's statesmanship. His Excellency knew the weak spot in the Swarajist armour. I am neither sorry nor surprised. I will not condemn Mr. Tambe. He has done India and the Swaraj Party a great service. His acceptance of office is not so much an exposure of his weakness as of the ostrich policy of the Swaraj Party. This policy is in practice not only in the Central Provinces but also elsewhere. It is none other than putting untried politicians unknown to suffering and sacrifice in positions of trust and responsibility. Mr. Tambe was an old Congressman but he ceased to figure on its platform when the Congress became extremist. If he could not imbibe the Swarajist principles, though he joined the Party, it was obviously not his fault. This incident must also be an eye-opener against the craze for unity for broadening the Swarajist platform to accommodate the Independents, Liberals and other full blooded cooperators. Unity can be achieved only at the peril of liquidating the Swaraj Party and the principle not to accept office so long as India is denied her rights. Even the Swaraj Party cannot escape the law of Karma."

2. The charge against Mr. C.S. Ranga Iyer is that in making the above statement he has been guilty of a gross breach of discipline in that he has attempted to bring the Swaraj Party into ridicule and contempt which is highly reprehensible on the part of a member while he enjoys the privileges of membership.

3. Mr. C.S. Ranga Iyer is requested to submit his explanation in writing to the President of the Party and is also invited to attend the meeting at Nagpur on the 1st November to make such further explanations as he may be advised.

(Motilal Nehru)  
President of the All India Swaraj Party

186. To M.R. Jayakar<sup>1</sup>

Anand Bhawan  
Allahabad  
22nd October 1925

Dear Jayakar,

On my return from Sitapur this morning I received the letter which you wrote on the eve of the fateful interview you gave to the *Daily Mail*<sup>2</sup>. The full report of the interviews given by you and Kelkar also came by the same post. Whatever I have said in the Press statement issued by me on your interview

<sup>1</sup>M.R. Jayakar Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Indian Daily Mail was launched from Bombay by J.B. Petit with F.W. Holsinger as its editor. It was started as an evening newspaper.

189. To Krishna Ballabh Sahay<sup>1</sup>

26th October 1925

Dear Mr. Krishnaballabh Sahai,

Your letter of the 21st. The correct position in [regard] to the advances made by me to any Province is that the [moment] I actually advance the money I place it at the disposal of [the] Province concerned unless I earmark it for any particular purpose. The amount I have sent you has been advanced for the general organization of the Province and not for any particular purpose. It is therefore for your Provincial Committee or its Executive to decide how it is to be spent and in this respect the rules of the Provincial Party should be complied with. What I can and will do is to withhold any further advances if the money already sent is not in my opinion rightly spent. As [I] have already told you I must have a detailed account of every rupee spent before complying with any further requisition for an advance.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

190. To the Editor<sup>2</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
29th October 1925

Dear,

I enclose an Appeal for contributions to the defence fund of the Congress workers who have been arrested in connection with the Kakori<sup>3</sup> and other dacoities. Some of them are personally known to me and I cannot for a moment believe that they have been guilty of the serious offence charged.

As you are aware thousands of innocent persons suffered imprisonment in the Non-cooperation days without making any defence. This has enabled the Government and the Police to lay hands on Congressmen under any pretext

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers.<sup>2</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.)

<sup>3</sup>Kakori Conspiracy Case: Of the many revolutionary activities in the U.P., the Kakori train dacoity is one of the most important. A passenger train was stopped and looted just after leaving Kakori station near Lucknow on the evening of 9 August 1925. A large number of revolutionaries were arrested and tried on a charge of conspiracy to commit dacoity and murder. The trial began in December 1925 in Lucknow and the final judgement was announced in August 1927. Defence was conducted by B. K. Choudhury, a barrister from Calcutta, Govind Ballabh Pant, R. F. Bahadurji, Mohanlal Saksena and Chandra Bhanu Gupta assisted the defence. Ram Prasad 'Bismil', Rajendra Nath Lahiri, Asfaqullah Khan and Roshan Singh were hanged, Jogesh Chandra Chatterjee, Sachindra Nath Sanyal and three others were sentenced to transportation for life and eleven received sentences for various terms of imprisonment. Chandra Shekhar Azad escaped arrest.

187. To Purshotamdas Thakurdas<sup>1</sup>

26th October 1925

Dear Sir Purshotamdas,

I have delayed replying your letter of the 3rd October in the hope of being able to inform you of the date of my arrival in Bombay. I am sorry that hope has not materialised and I am still very uncertain about my movements. All I know is that I shall be in Nagpur on the 1st November. For how long and where to go next it is not possible to say at present. It will of course give me great pleasure to accept the hospitality of Lady Purshotamdas<sup>2</sup> but I shall do so without your intervention and thus prevent you from changing dinner into breakfast or vice versa and putting me off altogether.

You talk of not understanding the methods of "Leaders" but they are not half so inscrutable as those of the Merchant Princes of Bombay. I thought there was no question of persuading anybody so far as Manmohan Das was concerned. However it is the way with those who wish to put off the evil day of redeeming their promises as far as they can. I do not think I will trouble you to waste any time for persuading this lot.

More when we meet.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

188. To Maulvi Shafee<sup>3</sup>

26.10.1925

Dear Maulvi Shafee,

Your wire. Have duly nominated you in place of Hakim Ajmal Khan and you must now be ready to start on the 30th or the 31st. The best train for you is the Bombay Mail which leaves Gaya at 3-54 A.M. This will land you in Nagpur via Itarsi at 7 O' Clock next morning. I shall arrive at Nagpur on the afternoon of the 31st. Please wire your arrival to Abhyankar and ask him to arrange for your stay if you have no friends of your own to whom you would like to go.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).

<sup>2</sup>Lady Dhankoreben Purshotamdas Thakurdas; b. 1884; daughter of Damji Bhanji Kothari, relative of a Dewan of Kutch State; married to Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas at the age of 19; d. 1976.

<sup>3</sup>AICC Papers.

189. To Krishna Ballabh Sahay<sup>1</sup>

26th October 1925

Dear Mr. Krishnaballabh Sahai,

Your letter of the 21st. The correct position in [regard] to the advances made by me to any Province is that the [moment] I actually advance the money I place it at the disposal of [the] Province concerned unless I earmark it for any particular purpose. The amount I have sent you has been advanced for the general organization of the Province and not for any particular purpose. It is therefore for your Provincial Committee or its Executive to decide how it is to be spent and in this respect the rules of the Provincial Party should be complied with. What I can and will do is to withhold any further advances if the money already sent is not in my opinion rightly spent. As [I] have already told you I must have a detailed account of every rupee spent before complying with any further requisition for an advance.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

190. To the Editor<sup>2</sup>

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
29th October 1925

Dear,

I enclose an Appeal for contributions to the defence fund of the Congress workers who have been arrested in connection with the Kakori<sup>3</sup> and other dacoities. Some of them are personally known to me and I cannot for a moment believe that they have been guilty of the serious offence charged.

As you are aware thousands of innocent persons suffered imprisonment in the Non-cooperation days without making any defence. This has enabled the Government and the Police to lay hands on Congressmen under any pretext

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers<sup>2</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).

<sup>3</sup>Kakori Conspiracy Case. Of the many revolutionary activities in the U.P., the Kakori train dacoity is one of the most important. A passenger train was stopped and looted just after leaving Kakori station near Lucknow on the evening of 9 August 1925. A large number of revolutionaries were arrested and tried on a charge of conspiracy to commit dacoity and murder. The trial began in December 1925 in Lucknow and the final judgement was announced in August 1927. Defence was conducted by B. K. Choudhury, a barrister from Calcutta, Govind Ballabh Pant, R. T. Bahadurji, Mohanlal Saksena and Chandra Bhanu Gupta assisted the defence. Ram Prasad 'Bismil', Rajendra Nath Lahiri, Ashfaqullah Khan and Roshan Singh were hanged, Jogesh Chandra Chatterjee, Sachindra Nath Sanyal and three others were sentenced to transportation for life and eleven received sentences for various terms of imprisonment. Chandra Shekhar Azad escaped arrest.

187. To Purshotamdas Thakurdas<sup>1</sup>

26th October 1925

Dear Sir Purshotamdas,

I have delayed replying your letter of the 3rd October in the hope of being able to inform you of the date of my arrival in Bombay. I am sorry that hope has not materialised and I am still very uncertain about my movements. All I know is that I shall be in Nagpur on the 1st November. For how long and where to go next it is not possible to say at present. It will of course give me great pleasure to accept the hospitality of Lady Purshotamdas<sup>2</sup> but I shall do so without your intervention and thus prevent you from changing dinner into breakfast or vice versa and putting me off altogether.

You talk of not understanding the methods of "Leaders" but they are not half so inscrutable as those of the Merchant Princes of Bombay. I thought there was no question of persuading anybody so far as Manmohan Das was concerned. However it is the way with those who wish to put off the evil day of redeeming their promises as far as they can. I do not think I will trouble you to waste any time for persuading this lot.

More when we meet.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

188. To Maulvi Shafec<sup>3</sup>

26.10.1925

Dear Maulvi Shafec,

Your wire. Have duly nominated you in place of Hakim Ajmal Khan and you must now be ready to start on the 30th or the 31st. The best train for you is the Bombay Mail which leaves Gaya at 3-54 A.M. This will land you in Nagpur via Itarsi at 7 O' Clock next morning. I shall arrive at Nagpur on the afternoon of the 31st. Please wire your arrival to Abhyankar and ask him to arrange for your stay if you have no friends of your own to whom you would like to go.

Yours sincerely,  
(Motilal Nehru)

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.)

<sup>2</sup>Lady Dhankoreben Purshotamdas Thakurdas; b. 1884; daughter of Damji Bhanji Kothari, relative of a Dewan of Kutch State; married to Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas at the age of 19; d. 1976.

<sup>3</sup>AICC Papers.

I am afraid I cannot see Mahatmaji as promised. My tour will take over two weeks and it will hardly be possible to come back to Bombay. I shall write to him direct. Goswami is with me. With love to all.

Please ask Ranjit to let me know here about the cabin for bim & Nan.

Your loving  
Father

192.-Telegram to K.F. Nariman<sup>1</sup>

Nariman MLC  
Municipal Corporation Bombay

Please inform how many Bombay Councillors were elected on Swarajist ticket and how many of them support Jayakars present attitude towards Party Wire here today Bhandara tomorrow Raipur sixteenth Bilaspur seventeenth Allahabad thereafter stop Expect you and Jamnadas deal with Kelkar Jayakar.

Motilal Nehru  
14.11.25

193. To T.C. Goswami<sup>2</sup>

23rd November 1925

My dear Tulsi,

I have already sent you a long letter. Your letter addressed to Nagpur has just reached me. Much water has since passed under the bridge and the Mahratta rebels have hardened considerably. That was only to be expected. I hope we shall deal with them adequately in the near future.

I am afraid I cannot make an extended tour through the remaining centres of Maharashtra as I had hoped to do. I have to be in Delhi on the 14th December for the Skeen Committee and require a few days stay before and after the tour in Allahabad to dispose of sundry matters including the very serious thing which is at present worrying me viz. the treatment of my daughter-in-law. We cannot however leave Poona to the tender mercies of the Kelkar group for long. It is therefore my intention to go to Ahmedabad as soon as I am able to get away and after a conference with Gandhi, Patel and Sarojini proceed to Poona and take a few more places on the way back to Allahabad, if possible. I should like you to meet me at Bombay about the 2nd or 3rd December and then to accompany me to Poona and such other places as we may determine upon. Please let me know if you can do this.

I enclose a communication from the Employees' Association, Calcutta, complaining of the attitude of the Editor of the *Forward* towards the Associa-

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers.

<sup>2</sup>AICC Papers.

they choose. It is time now that these methods should be thoroughly exposed. Arrangements are therefore being made to defend the public workers who have been accused but are believed to be quite innocent.

I am enclosing a private appeal for the funds required for this purpose and hope it will receive a liberal response from you. I need hardly say that it is not a Congress or Swaraj Party propaganda but merely a human endeavour to save innocent persons from injustice.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

191. To Jawahar<sup>1</sup>

"Soonita"  
Ridge Road.  
Malabar Hill.  
5.11.25

My dear Jawahar,

I received your letter this morning on arrival. I do hope you have been able to arrange for a boat for Kamla, your mother & Indu to pass a few days on the river. The best arrangement is to get two big ordinary country boats tied together and a tent pitched on them for living. There should be a separate boat for the kitchen and a small boat for communication with the shore. I think I expressed this idea to you. However any arrangement ensuring comfortable living on the river will do & I hope you have made it.

My trip to Nagpur was a great success. Even the garbled accounts in the hostile press will have shown you the real work done which was nothing less than the rehabilitation of the Swaraj Party in public favour. After spending three or four days here I shall begin my tour in the Berar & the two C.Ps. The programme will be finally settled in the course of the day and will be posted to you separately.

I find Tata has written and wired to Nan to come here and pass a few days with me. I do hope they will do nothing so silly.

I agree in what you say about Jagat Narayan but if he is still hoping against all hope to get the Govt. briefs he will not definitely promise to bind himself down to anything. What you say about Kamada Prasad is perfectly true. I could not imagine any Indian of ordinary education and intelligence to be so hopelessly ignorant of the atmosphere in which he lived. This ignorance will undoubtedly be a serious handicap in his putting forward any defence.

Rafi has gone to Cawnpore. Upadhia is with me. I cannot think of anything else.

Yes, there is one thing. Jamnalalji is lying ill at Wardha but hopes to be able to attend the Ahmedabad meeting on the 10th.

I am afraid I cannot see Mahatmaji as promised. My tour will take over two weeks and it will hardly be possible to come back to Bombay. I shall write to him direct. Goswami is with me. With love to all.

Please ask Ranjit to let me know here about the cabin for him & Nan.

Your loving  
Father

192.- Telegram to K.F. Nariman<sup>1</sup>

Nariman MLC  
Municipal Corporation Bombay

Please inform how many Bombay Councillors were elected on Swarajist ticket and how many of them support Jayakars present attitude towards Party Wire here today Bhandara tomorrow Raipur sixteenth Bilaspur seventeenth Allahabad thereafter stop Expect you and Jamnadas deal with Kelkar Jayakar.

Motilal Nehru  
14.11.25

193. To T.C. Goswami<sup>2</sup>

23rd November 1925

My dear Tulsī,

I have already sent you a long letter. Your letter addressed to Nagpur has just reached me. Much water has since passed under the bridge and the Mahratta rebels have hardened considerably. That was only to be expected. I hope we shall deal with them adequately in the near future.

I am afraid I cannot make an extended tour through the remaining centres of Maharashtra as I had hoped to do. I have to be in Delhi on the 14th December for the Skeen Committee and require a few days stay before and after the tour in Allahabad to dispose of sundry matters including the very serious thing which is at present worrying me viz. the treatment of my daughter-in-law. We cannot however leave Poona to the tender mercies of the Kelkar group for long. It is therefore my intention to go to Ahmedabad as soon as I am able to get away and after a conference with Gandhi, Patel and Sarojini proceed to Poona and take a few more places on the way back to Allahabad, if possible. I should like you to meet me at Bombay about the 2nd or 3rd December and then to accompany me to Poona and such other places as we may determine upon. Please let me know if you can do this.

I enclose a communication from the Employees' Association, Calcutta, complaining of the attitude of the Editor of the *Forward* towards the Associa-

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers.

<sup>2</sup>AICC Papers.



they choose. It is time now that these methods should be thoroughly exposed. Arrangements are therefore being made to defend the public workers who have been accused but are believed to be quite innocent.

I am enclosing a private appeal for the funds required for this purpose and hope it will receive a liberal response from you. I need hardly say that it is not a Congress or Swaraj Party propaganda but merely a human endeavour to save innocent persons from injustice.

Yours sincerely,  
Motilal Nehru

191. To Jawahar<sup>1</sup>

"Soonita"  
Ridge Road.  
Malabar Hill.  
5.11.25

My dear Jawahar,

I received your letter this morning on arrival. I do hope you have been able to arrange for a boat for Kamla, your mother & Indu to pass a few days on the river. The best arrangement is to get two big ordinary country boats tied together and a tent pitched on them for living. There should be a separate boat for the kitchen and a small boat for communication with the shore. I think I expressed this idea to you. However any arrangement ensuring comfortable living on the river will do & I hope you have made it.

My trip to Nagpur was a great success. Even the garbled accounts in the hostile press will have shown you the real work done which was nothing less than the rehabilitation of the Swaraj Party in public favour. After spending three or four days here I shall begin my tour in the Berar & the two C.Ps. The programme will be finally settled in the course of the day and will be posted to you separately.

I find Tata has written and wired to Nan to come here and pass a few days with me. I do hope they will do nothing so silly.

I agree in what you say about Jagat Narayan but if he is still hoping against all hope to get the Govt. briefs he will not definitely promise to bind himself down to anything. What you say about Kamuda Prasad is perfectly true. I could not imagine any Indian of ordinary education and intelligence to be so hopelessly ignorant of the atmosphere in which he lived. This ignorance will undoubtedly be a serious handicap in his putting forward any defence.

Rafi has gone to Cawnpore. Upadhia is with me. I cannot think of anything else.

Yes, there is one thing. Jamnalalji is lying ill at Wardha but hopes to be able to attend the Ahmedabad meeting on the 10th.

tion. Please go into this matter and give a suitable answer to the Secretary. I am simply writing to him that I have forwarded his communication to you for disposal.

Chaman and Ranga Iyer have fallen out. The latter has written a long letter to me complaining of various things. He has come back to Lucknow and will see me in the course of a day or two.

Please wire your reply about meeting me in Bombay.

Yours affectionately,  
(Motilal Nehru)

194 To K.F. Nariman<sup>1</sup>

23.11.1925

Dear Mr. Nariman,

Thanks for your wire and the letter of the 18th November.

The situation created in the Bombay Council is a difficult one and has to [be] delicately handled. There is no doubt that the Swarajists in the Bombay Council are under the jurisdiction of the Bombay Provincial Party. I wish Mr. Jamnadas Mehta had called a meeting of the Party before calling upon the Swarajists signatories to the memorandum either to submit to the Nagpur resolution or resign. However it is not too late to do so now and I am writing to him to take the necessary steps. As for the attitude to be adopted by you it should I think be solely guided by the instructions you receive from the Provincial Party. You will then be able to proceed authoritatively on the matter. As I am writing to Mr. Jamnadas Mehta at some length I refer you to my letter to him for further information.

I hope to be in Bombay in the course of the next few days when I hope to have the pleasure of meeting you and discussing things in person.

Yours sincerely  
Motilal Nehru

195. To Mahatma Gandhi<sup>2</sup>

Anand Bhawan  
Allahabad  
25.11.25

Dear Mahatmaji,

I hope you have received my long letter acknowledging your two previous letters. Your short note recommending the Lucknow Hospital for Kamli was

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Gandhi papers.

Friday evening soon after I got your letter. He was just leaving but promised to see me the next day at Tatas. True to his promise he turned up yesterday at the appointed time and had a long talk with me (charging no fees). The result of it is that he is not quite convinced of the correctness of Sprawson's<sup>1</sup> diagnosis & thinks it is too early to pronounce the case definitely as one of T.B. The only indications so far are the sounds in the lungs and the persistent slow fever. These he thinks may be attributable to some other cause. The previous history makes it more likely than not. He has suggested a number of tests which he noted down at my request. I enclose a typed copy. I am afraid there are spelling mistakes in it as his handwriting is awful but any medical man will easily understand what he means.

The case is certainly a doubtful one and on the principle that all risks should be avoided he recommends as early a trip to Switzerland as possible. He shares Sprawson's opinion about the treatment recommended by Ansari (I forget the name of the man) but would leave the question open till Kamla reaches Switzerland and the various specialists there have had an opportunity to examine her. He does not think that the cold of a Switzerland winter will hurt her at all—on the contrary it will accelerate recovery under proper precautions. The last thing he has suggested (Raw's auto Tubercal antigerm) is his own discovery. It is still in the experimental stage & he does not claim any curative value for it but having tried it in many cases he has found it invariably arresting the progress of the disease. This is in effect all the talk I had with him.

We shall have Ansari at Cawnpore and by that time Sprawson will also have had Kamla for several weeks under his observation. We must make up our minds finally at Cawnpore. Delays must be avoided at all cost.

You must have read the understanding arrived at between me & Kelkar etc. I was too tired to travel on the 4th but had made up my mind to leave the next day (yesterday) but no lower berth was available by any of the three trains (Panjab Mail, Calcutta Mail, Lucknow Mail or Express) that I could have taken. Purshotamdas is arriving from Delhi tomorrow morning and I was advised to meet him before leaving. I have agreed to do so and am staying on but have to remove to the Tajmahal Hotel for the night and tomorrow till I leave. Tata's daughters' rooms are under repairs in expectation of their arrival on the 18th Decr. & there is already another guest besides myself in the house. Three members of the Currency Commission were invited by Tata to stay with him & they are arriving early tomorrow morning. Tata had ordered my things to be removed into his room and proposed to sleep outside in the verandah. I would not listen to it and am going to the Taj after dinner.

I am having this letter typed. The typed copy will go to Lucknow & this original to Allahabad. I have not yet made up my mind whether to go to Lucknow or Allahabad but will wire tomorrow.

I am going to Pratap to ask his wife to get me a good Ayah & if one is

<sup>1</sup>Cuthbert Allan Sprawson; b. 1877; Professor of Medicine, Allahabad University, 1913-23; Major-General, 1930; D. Litt. (Hon.), Lucknow University, 1930; Director-General, I.M.S., 1933-37, President, Medical Council of India, 1934-37; retired, 1937; d. 1956.

and to educate public opinion against such acceptance. I trust Messrs Dastane<sup>1</sup> and S.M. Paranjape<sup>2</sup> have already done some work to prepare the ground for me. I shall feel obliged if you will give me your help in this campaign. Kindly put yourself in communication with Messrs S.M. Paranjape and S.D. Deo.<sup>3</sup>

I shall put up at Poona in Mr. R.D. Tata's house. Messrs T.C. Goswami, Srinuvasa Iyengar, Rangaswami Iyengar and Jamnadas Mehta will probably come with me. Mr. Goswami will stay with me but I am not sure of the others. I suppose Mr. Jamnadas Mehta will make some arrangements for them

Yours sincerely  
Motilal Nehru

197. To Jawahar<sup>4</sup>

"Soonita"  
Ridge Road  
Malabar Hill  
Dec. 6th

My dear Jawahar,

I wired to you yesterday c/o Kishan at Lucknow telling you that I had been detained here till Monday night and asking you about your own movements. No reply has yet come. It may be that you could not go to Lucknow as you intended or that my telegram was delayed.

Dr. Raw<sup>5</sup> has been very good indeed. I saw him at his consulting rooms on

<sup>1</sup>Vasudev Vitthal Dastane, b. 1882; educated at Deccan College and Fergusson College, Poona; attracted to terrorist activities; entered legal profession in 1907; left practice during the non-cooperation movement; arrested during Mulshi Petha satyagraha; was engaged in constructive work in Khandesh; d. 1957.

<sup>2</sup>S. M. Paranjape, b. 1864, educated at Ratnagiri and Poona; Professor of Sanskrit, Maharashtra College, Poona, 1896-97; Secretary, Poona Sarvajanik Sabha; started a Marathi weekly, the *Kol*, 1898, elected to Poona Municipality, in 1908; participated in the non-cooperation movement and Mulshi Petha satyagraha; President, Maharashtra Sahitya Sammelan, Belgaum, 1929, d. 1929.

<sup>3</sup>Shankarrao Dattatraya Deo; b. 1891; worked in Champaran with Mahatma Gandhi, 1917, took part in the non-cooperation movement, 1920; one of the leaders of the Mulshi Petha satyagraha; took part in the civil disobedience movement; imprisoned several times, editor, *Swaraaj*; President, Maharashtra P.C.C., 1935; Chairman, Reception Committee, Faizpur Congress, 1936; participated in the individual satyagraha, 1941, Quit India movement, 1942 and imprisoned; General Secretary, A.I.C.C.; member, Constituent Assembly, 1948-50, d. 1974

<sup>4</sup>Jawaharlal Nehru Papers.

<sup>5</sup>Dr. Raghuvendra Row; b. 1871 at Honavar, Karnataka; eminent bacteriologist; educated at Grant Medical College, Bombay; first Tata Scholar; first Indian M.D. from London; married Pandita Kshama in 1906; wrote many research papers mainly on tropical diseases; awarded Kaiser-i-Hind Medal; personal physician to the Tatas; founder member and Chairman of the Indian Advisory Committee of the Lady Tata Memorial Trust; d. 1953.

*WRITINGS AND SPEECHES*

available I shall take her with me,

Your loving  
Father

Just received your telegram. I am sending this to Lucknow & hope to meet you there. But I shall wire.

198. *An Amendment by Motilal Nehru*<sup>1</sup>

I stand here simply to clear my position. I am not here to commend this or that resolution to you, nor am I here to move or oppose any amendment. I am here to tell you that the amendment of Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar which has been moved in this house as a compromise measure is an amendment which I am ready and willing to accept by way of compromise, not that I do not believe in my own amendment—I do stand by it, but to give and take, is the essence of compromise and I say that if the house is inclined to accept the compromise measure which has been moved by my friend Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar, I will not even put my amendment to the vote because I will take that amendment in the spirit in which it has been moved. But I wish to make it perfectly clear that I do believe that my amendment is the more prudent one and is the wiser one of the two, because I do not believe in tying my hands by any compromise or undertaking long long before the occasion arises but in order to show you that I have not set my heart on these councils and I do not necessarily believe or ask you to believe that entry into councils is necessary. I am perfectly willing to bind myself now in case you accept the amendment (Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar's amendment) by way of compromise. I have also stated that whether you accept the compromise or you do not accept it, nothing can be further from my intention than to resort to the least little co-operation with the Government in any particular. But either in the matter of standing for councils or in the matter of going further than that, it must be of our own national council outside the Government council. I have pointed out to you that after the elections, going into the councils is not only the thing open to us. In fact, it is one of those things which I least like. What is open to us is that we may form National councils, of our own, elected by the very people who elect the Government councils, elected by the very people whom you have to go to and on whom you have to depend for the purpose of civil disobedience. Because you must remember that it is the taxpayer and taxpayer alone who can make your movement of civil disobedience a success by joining it—by withholding taxes. Before that time comes all attempts can but be incomplete and infructuous.

This is my position. Please consider the position and consider all the arguments. As for my arguments, I say—refer to what I have stated in the Report of the Civil Disobedience Enquiry Committee and I also rely strongly upon the remarks of our worthy President which you have heard in his Presidential address. It is unnecessary to take any further time and with this explanation I beg to retire.

*Speeches and Writings*

Vidyavachaspati,<sup>1</sup> Delhi, and Pandit Radha Krishna Bhargava<sup>2</sup> Zemindar, Muttra.

Punjab and N.W.F. Province—Professor Ruchi Ram Sahni and Maulana Abdul Quadir<sup>3</sup>, Lahore, and Sardar Jagjit Singh, Abbottabad.

Sindh—The assistant editor, *New Times*, Karachi, and Mr. Sukhramdas,<sup>4</sup> Headmaster, National School, Sukkur.

C.P. Hindustani—Syt. Seth Govind Das, Jubbulpore, and Syt. E. Raghvendra Rao, Bilaspur.

C.P. Marathi—Dr. B.S. Moonje and Syt. M V. Abhyankar, Nagpur.

Berar—Syt. M.S. Ancy, Berar.

Bombay—Syt. M.R. Jayakar and Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta, Bombay.

Maharashtra—Syts. N.C. Kelkar and D.V. Gokhale, Poona.

Karnataka—Syt. D.V. Belvi, Belgaon.

Kerala—Syt. A.K. Pillai,<sup>5</sup> Trivandrum.

Tamil Nadu—Syt. A. Rangaswamy Ayyangar and S. Satyamurti, Madras.

Andhra—Syts. V. Ramdas, High Court Vakil, Mylapore, Madras,

<sup>1</sup>Indra Vidyavachaspati; b. 1889 at Jullundur; son of Swami Shraddhanand; educated at Gurukul Vishvavidyalaya, Kangri; educationist; Vice-Chancellor, Gurukul Vishvavidyalaya, Kangri; journalist; edited daily *Vaibhava*, *Vijaya*, *Nav Rashtra* and *Vir Arjun*; President, Delhi P.C.C., 1935-36, member, Provisional Parliament, 1950-51, Rajya Sabha, 1952-58; d. 1960.

<sup>2</sup>Radha Krishna Bhargava; b. 1881; a civil lawyer of Mathura; joined the non-cooperation movement in 1921 and was arrested; President, Mathura District Congress, 1921; organised Bal Sabhas; practised at Allahabad, 1936-41, returned to Mathura and died in 1944.

<sup>3</sup>Maulana Abdul Qadir Kasuri; b. 1874; lawyer, politician and journalist. Editor, *The Observer*, 1898-1904, *Makhzan*, 1901-11; member, Punjab Legislative Council, 1924-29; Additional Judge, Lahore High Court, 1930-32, 1934, member, Secretary of State's Council, 1934; Advisor to the Secretary of State for India, 1937-39; Chief Justice, Bhawalpur State, 1940-43; d. 1950.

<sup>4</sup>Sukhramdas Tulsidas Tanwermalani; b. 1892 at Larkana, Sind, son-in-law of Diwan Kauremal Chandanmal Khilnari, educated at Larkana, Karachi and Bombay; teacher, Government High Schools at Larkana and Shikarpur; left Government service to participate in the non-cooperation movement, 1920-21; Headmaster, National School, Sukkur; Administrative Officer of municipal schools in Sukkur, Sind, 1926-35; d. 1935.

<sup>5</sup>A.K. Pillai, b. 1893, Bar-at-law; as a student at Oxford, gave up studies and returned to India to take part in the non-cooperation movement in 1921; member, Kerala P.C.C.; organised the work of the Congress in Travancore; took part in Vaikom satyagraha and was imprisoned for four months; started a Malayalam journal *Swara*; was one of the promoters of the London Branch of the Indian National Congress and represented it at the Cologne session of the League against Imperialism; associated with A.C.N. Nambiar, M.N. Roy and other revolutionaries in Berlin; returned to India and enrolled as an Advocate of the Calcutta Bar in 1930; member, A.I.C.C. for several years; President, Madras branch of Travancore State Congress; d. 1949.



199 *The Swaraj Party, 9 March 1923*<sup>1</sup>

The Congress Khilafat Swarajya Party formed at Gaya was truly organised under the name and style of the Swarajya Party at a general meeting of the Party held at Anand Bhawan, Allahabad on the 20th-22nd February, 1923. The programme and the constitution of the party as finally adopted have already been published in the press and printed copies will be sent to the members as soon as they are ready. A further meeting of the members present in Allahabad was held at Anand Bhawan, on the 28th February and the following provincial organisers were appointed. Members of the party and those intending to become members are requested to correspond with the organisers of their respective provinces and to remit the annual subscription (Rs. 3) to them.

The following are the organisers in the different provinces:—

Bengal—Syt B N. Sasmal, 73 Harish Mukherji Road Bhawanipur, Calcutta and Syt Sris Chandra Chatterji,<sup>2</sup> 38 Patlakhan's Lane, Dacca.

Assam—Syt. T.R. Phookan.<sup>3</sup>

Behar—Syt. Rai Hari Prasad,<sup>4</sup> Gaya, Syt. Chandrabansi Sahay<sup>5</sup> and Maulana Abdul Bari Patna.

United Provinces—Pandit Kapildev Malaviya, Allahabad, and Pandit Harkaran Nath Misra, Lucknow.

Delhi and Ajmer—H.M. Hakim Ajmal [Khan] Saheb and Prof. Indra

<sup>1</sup>*The Leader*, 10 March 1923.

<sup>2</sup>Sris Chandra Chatterjee; b. 1873; educated at Dacca; associated with the Dacca branch of the Anushilan Samiti; defended the nationalists involved in the Dacca Conspiracy Case, 1910, Barisal Conspiracy Case, 1913, Gauhati Shooting Case, 1917; member, Swaraj Party; Secretary, Khilafat Committee, Dacca, imprisoned in 1931 in connection with the Durno Shooting Case, President, Dacca District Congress Committee, 1935; member, Pakistan Constituent Assembly and leader of the Opposition, 1948-55, left Pakistan in 1962, d. 1966.

<sup>3</sup>T.R. Phookan; b. 1877 at Gauhati; educated at Gauhati H.E. School and Presidency College, Calcutta, practised at Calcutta High Court; joined Congress, 1920 participated in the non-cooperation movement; supported Motilal Nehru and C.R. Das at the Gaya Congress, 1922, Chairman, Reception Committee, Gauhati Congress, 1926; member, Congress Working Committee, 1927, took a prominent part in the opium prohibition campaign; d. 1939.

<sup>4</sup>Rai Hari Prasad Lal; b. 1888; zamindar; belonged to Gaya; member, Bihar Landholders' Association, President, Gaya District Congress Committee, 1919-20, All India Hindu Association and Kayastha Sadar Sabha; elected to the Indian Legislative Assembly in 1923; Chairman, Gaya Municipality, 1933-34, Gaya District Board, 1936, and Sadar Central Co-operative Bank, Gaya; d. 1960.

<sup>5</sup>Chandrabansi Sahay; b. 1885, practised at Patna High Court; suspended practice and joined the non-cooperation movement in 1921; President, Patna District Congress Committee; member, A.I.C.C.; resumed practice in 1926, Executive Officer, Patna City Municipality, 1932-37, appointed Special Officer in the Local Self-Government and served in Gaya and Bhagalpur Municipalities, 1946-51; d. 1976.

brisk propaganda is being carried on directly and indirectly by the Government servants against Congressmen in spite of the assurances given by his Excellency the Governor in his recent speeches that the electors would not be influenced by the Government in any way.

These are among the difficulties to be overcome within the short space of 10 days, but I trust the people of these provinces will rise to the occasion and once again demonstrate their unshakable loyalty to the Congress. Having regard to all the circumstances, I would suggest the following line of action to the Congress workers in the various tahsils and polling centres:—The candidates already nominated should be approached with a view to find out which of them are ready and willing to abide by the Congress policy in so far as it is or may hereafter become applicable to any matter connected with the district board administration, and Congress workers should support the candidature of such of them as will give an undertaking to that effect against those who will not. The names of the candidates thus approved should be made known to the electors by public announcements and such village to village visits as may be possible in the circumstances. Whenever returning officers are appointed in whom the public have no confidence the higher authorities should be informed and steps taken to ensure the presence of a representative of the candidates at the poll to watch the proceedings. The rest may be left to the good sense of the voter, whose judgement may in the vast majority of cases be fully relied upon. I feel sure that by adopting this procedure the results of district board elections will be as satisfactory as can well be expected having regard to serious disadvantages under which Congressmen are placed and I accordingly recommend active steps to be taken on these lines without loss of time.

#### *201. Election Campaign not to be Interrupted, 2 May 1923<sup>1</sup>*

At an informal conference at Delhi on the 24th April attended by Hakim Ajmal Khan, Syt. C. Rajagopalachari, Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, Dr. M.A. Ansari, Mr. T.A.K. Sherwani, Mr. Moazzam Ali<sup>2</sup> and Dr. Syed Mahmud, a basis for a common understanding was arrived at with a view to all Congress leaders joining together in pressing a united programme before the people. On the 29th April Mr. C. Rajagopalachari wired to Mr. C.R. Das at Calcutta to the effect that Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel and Seth Jamnalal Bajaj did not approve of the understanding arrived at in Delhi. The last attempt to secure complete unity between the two wings of the Congress has thus failed. All members of the Swarajya party are therefore requested to begin at once an intensive Council propaganda in all provinces and districts. They are particularly warn-

<sup>1</sup>*The Leader*, 4 May 1923.

<sup>2</sup>Shaikh Moazzam Ali Khan; b. 1880 at Rampur; educated at M.A.O. College, Aligarh and Oxford University; called to the Bar in 1906, led the agitation against the internment of Ali Brothers, 1917; Secretary, Central Khilafat Committee, 1921; member, Civil Disobedience Enquiry Committee, 1922; Legal Adviser to the Maharaja of Indore State; Chief Justice and Home Minister of Rampur State, after retirement again settled at Indore; d. 1941.

V. Lakshmi Narayana<sup>1</sup>, Guntur, and K.V.R. Swami<sup>2</sup>, Rajahmundry.

Motilal Nehru

General Secretary

Anand Bhawan, Allahabad, March 4.

*200. On District Board Elections, 31 March 1923<sup>3</sup>*

I take this opportunity of congratulating the Congressmen and Congress Committees in the United Provinces whose efforts have borne such excellent fruit at the recent elections to the municipal boards and desire to convey to the electors the keen appreciation of their public spirit by the Congress. The election of Congressmen to all but a few municipal boards, in large majorities, despite certain doubtful practices resorted to against them in certain places, has shown the abiding faith of the people of these provinces in the great national institution and those who represent it. I have no doubt that they will have the satisfaction of seeing that their confidence was fully justified. Yet another and a more difficult trial waits them. The district board elections are about to be held. The time for filing nomination papers expired while Congressmen were still busy with the municipal elections and it was not possible in many places to nominate Congress candidates. In the districts where nominations were made by the Congress Committees, such as Aligarh, quite a large number of nomination papers were rejected, without any reasons being communicated to the persons concerned. The electoral rolls used are those prepared three years ago for the last Council elections and are entirely out of date. Corrections due to numerous changes that have occurred since, have been made, if at all, without any notice to the public and corrected copies were not ready to be issued till about the middle of the month, though it is believed that the favoured classes have had full access to these for months past. During my present tour it has been reported to me in various towns that a

<sup>1</sup>Lakshminarayana Unnava; b. 1873, a lawyer from Guntur; went to England in 1913 and then to Ireland; deeply interested in the Irish nationalist movement; on his return gave up legal profession; imprisoned, 1921; on his release took to social reconstruction work; founded the 'Saradaniketan', an advocate of a separate Andhra province; d. 1958.

<sup>2</sup>K.V.R. Swami Naidu; b. 1875 at Rajahmundry; educated at Rajahmundry and Madras; lawyer, politician; joined the Justice Party; member, Rajahmundry Municipal Council, and Godavari District Board, 1901-05, Vice-President, Polavaram Taluk Board, 1902-05; member, Ellore Municipal Council, 1907-20, Madras Legislative Council, 1921-26; Minister for Agriculture, Cooperation, Industries and Fisheries, Madras Government, 1921-23; member of the Indian delegation to the League of Nations, Geneva, 1928, Agent-General to the Government of India in South Africa, 1929-32; Law Member, Governor's Executive Council, Madras, 1934-37; Acting Governor, Madras, 1936, nominated to the Madras Legislative Council in 1937; First Premier, Madras, April-July 1937; Vice-Chancellor, Annamalai University; d. 1942.

<sup>3</sup>*The Leader*, 2 April 1923. Circular to Congressmen.

Mahatma Gandhi and rise to the height of his expectation at least for three days. Let the Hindus remember that the whole movement inaugurated by Mahatma Gandhi directly arose out of the Khilafat question and was only subsequently extended to the attainment of Swarajya. Let not the Moham-medans forget that Lausanne has only witnessed a partial fruition of the collective effort of Nationalist India and that the great question of Jaziratul-Arab awaits a mightier collective effort for complete Swarajya. Now is the time to close up our ranks in perfect amity and concord if we can ever hope to attain Swarajya. Consider for one moment what either community can possibly expect to gain if one gets the upper hand of the other in the senseless squabbles which are now going on. Will either be any nearer the goal than now? No. Every point scored by one community against the other simply adds a fresh link to the chain which holds both in bondage. I appeal to you from my sick-bed to awake to the realities of the situation and give at least one tangible proof of your love and respect for the motherland even in the midst of your quarrels by celebrating the *Bakrid* in the manner suggested.

203. *Reply to an address by the Municipal Board, Lucknow, 16 August 1923<sup>1</sup>.*

I thank you for the honour you have done to the cause I represent by presenting an address to me and I congratulate you on the manly spirit which inspires that address. I am not so vain as to think that I have done anything so remarkable as to be singled out for special honour on this occasion. Grateful as I am for all the kind sentiments you have expressed I do not think that they entitle me to the honour you have conferred on me. My view of today's function is that you are adopting a perfectly legitimate means to a perfectly legitimate end. Your undoubted right has been assailed and you have manfully stood up to defend it. I take it that you have chosen me as an instrument for the protection of that right and I feel highly honoured by your choice. There is nothing so welcome to a public worker as an opportunity for service and no opportunity for service is valued more highly than that which helps the vindication of public rights. The citizens of Lucknow have the indisputable right to honour whom they please and you as the chosen representatives of the people of Lucknow have bravely stood up to vindicate that right against official interference. The manner in which that right has been assailed is a matter of common knowledge and I need not give the exact terms of the Government order on the subject.

You are also aware of the interpretation recently put by his Excellency the Governor on that order. His Excellency's explanation, while it disowns any intention on the part of his Government to deprive you of that right amounts to a confession of undoubted interference with its free exercise. The reason given is that the Government was anxious to prevent the waste of municipal funds on political purposes. We all know the genesis of this laudable solicitude for municipal economy. It was the extravagance of the Allahabad

<sup>1</sup>The Leader, 18 August 1923

ed against allowing themselves to be influenced by irresponsible talk of likely compromises as it has now been definitely settled that the work of organising the election campaign will not under any circumstances be interrupted.

Members of the All-India Committee of the Indian National Congress are informed that under article 4 of the constitution of the Swarajya party such of them as become members and pay the annual subscription of Rs 3 will be *ex-officio* members of the General Swarajya Council corresponding to the All-India Committee. Under article 5 the president will nominate seven members of the General Swarajya Council as members of its Executive Committee (corresponding to the Working Committee of the Congress) on the 10th May. It is requested that members already registered who have not yet paid their subscriptions and others who may desire to join the party will forthwith send their subscriptions to the General Secretary so as to allow the President as wide a field for the election of the Executive Council as possible. Each provincial organization is also requested to elect two members to the General Swarajya Council and communicate their names to the General Secretary before the 10th May (article 4).

Provinces and districts which have not yet appointed their General and Executive Committees are requested to do so and communicate their names to the General Secretary before the 15th May.

Motilal Nehru  
General Secretary

Anand Bhawan, Allahabad, May 2.

### 202 Appeal to Hindus and Muslims, 23 July 1923<sup>1</sup>

The instructions issued by the Central Khilafat Committee for the joint observance of the Turkish Peace by Hindus and Mohammedans throughout India on coming *Bakrid* day have my hearty support. I wish I could take active part in these celebrations but my continued ill-health compels me to stay in the hills for sometime. All I can do is to issue this earnest appeal to my countrymen. I regard the joint celebration directed by Khilafat Committee as not only the right thing to do but the imperative duty of every Hindu and Mussalman. There can be no doubt that the happy culmination of Lausanne negotiations has in no small measure been brought about by joint effort of Hindus and Mussalmans in India. The patriotic part they took in the struggle for Khilafat has from time to time been gratefully acknowledged by the highest functionaries of the Angora Government who have not omitted to pay a graceful tribute of respect and admiration for the skilful guidance of the movement by the great Leader of both Hindu and Mussalman nationalists. I ask them both to imagine how that great Leader if he were out of jail would have acted at the present moment. I ask them to sink the unfortunate differences which are now rending into shreds the communal peace and harmony established by

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers. Message on Turkish Peace Celebrations.

resolution which proposed an expenditure of one anna only out of municipal funds for the presentation of this address, but I take the kind gift in the spirit in which it is made and thank the municipal contractors for it.

204. *Reply to an address by the Kanpur Municipality, 20 August 1923<sup>1</sup>*

I thank you for the very kind sentiments you have expressed in the address just read out. You have referred to my early career as a student and at the bar. You have rightly said that the city of Cawnpore is as much mine as it is yours. I may tell you that there still exist in Cawnpore places which were, in the words of the poet, 'seats of my youth, when every sport could please.' Your reference to those days revives happy memories of the pleasant past. That was a happy dream which, alas ! has now passed away and we are face to face with solid facts and stern realities of life. In facing these we have pursued our own ways which may differ from each other but are directed to the one end of doing our duty to the best of our ability.

You have given the first place to my success as a lawyer. I have no doubt attained a measure of success in my profession, but I do not think that it entitles me to the honour you have done me. Whatever professional success I may have achieved was in pursuit of filthy lucre and not meant as public service. You have also noticed the little service I have been able to render to the cause of practical social reform. Here again I may have done some little work while engaged mainly in my business and other things. The best of that also does not, in my judgement, deserve any public recognition. You are all aware of the one work of my life to which I hope to devote the remainder of my days. The only claim I can possibly have to your appreciation arises out of that work. But the prominent mention you have made of the fact that all of you may or may not see eye to eye with me in that conviction deprives me of my sole title to public recognition.

When I arrived in Cawnpore I was only aware of your kind intention to honour. The address itself was shown to me in proof only a few minutes ago. At first I felt myself placed in an awkward position but did not hesitate long in making up my mind to accept the honour you proposed to confer on me. The reason was that you as representatives of the people were honouring me on their behalf and I had no manner of doubt that the heart of dear old Cawnpore was sound.

I know that most of those you represent do see eye to eye with me and I see their feelings between the lines of your address and not in the words used in it. You see the mark of their appreciation painted in sandal on my forehead just as I was entering that hall. Besides, I assume that most, if not all, of you do see eye to eye with me, for if that were not so you and I would not have been here this evening.

There is another aspect of the matter which calls for the expression of my

<sup>1</sup>*The Leader*, 22 August 1923.

municipal board in voting the very considerable sum of Rs. 25 for an address presented to that living embodiment of the spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion to the country, Deshbandhu C.R. Das. I wonder if his Excellency took note of the political purpose behind the address presented to himself by a neighbouring municipality which set apart the small item of Rs. 500 for the purpose. But whether his Excellency did so or not the people whose money was spent did not fail to emphasize the real purpose of that address by observing a *hartal* in the city. That is however a matter between the taxpayers of the municipality concerned and its representatives on the board. What we are concerned with is the principle, laid down by his Excellency, upon which political purposes are excluded from municipal activities—I confess I am unable to understand that principle. It is not easy to conceive the dividing line between political and civic rights. I am sure that if statistics were available they would show that the number of political leaders honoured by municipal bodies all over the world is not less but probably more than the number of those similarly honoured for other distinctions. But your position as elected members of the municipal board of Lucknow is unique. The majority of you have been elected by your electors for the political views you hold. I took a small part in your election campaign and know from personal experience how readily the Congress candidates were accepted by the electorates in preference to others. This means that your voters took your political views as the surest guarantee of your success as municipal administrators. Though you have been in office for a very short time you have by a fair and fearless discharge of your duties fully justified their expectations.

There is yet another and deeper significance in the function you are holding today. It has been stated that the Government order in question was recommended by a committee of the local Legislative Council and passed with the full concurrence of the Ministers. The Government machine moves with varying speed and it is not possible to say whether the Ministers referred to are the gems recently unearthed by his Excellency the Governor to shed their aristocratic lustre on a wondering world or those who after swallowing many camels laden with orders under the Criminal Law Amendment Act, the Seditious Meetings Act, and other similar goods so violently strained at a secretariat gnat which stung their personal dignity that they felt compelled to vacate office at a time when the new elections were in view. You have probably seen reported in the papers the harrowing details of his own martyrdom which one of them is laying before unsuspecting Council electorates. But whichever of the two distinguished pairs it may have been, the contrast between its submissive assent to an order highly prejudicial to public rights and your own courageous defence of those rights by this function today is too apparent to escape notice. The moral is clear to those who have eyes to see.

I thank the generous donors for their kind gift.<sup>1</sup> I have a shrewd suspicion that they have come to their rescue of the municipal board of Lucknow by supplying a substitute for a casket which the board could not afford out of Rs. 50 granted for the purpose. I for one should have preferred the original

<sup>1</sup>He was then presented with a silver *pandan* by the contractors of the municipal board.

resolution which proposed an expenditure of one anna only out of municipal funds for the presentation of this address, but I take the kind gift in the spirit in which it is made and thank the municipal contractors for it.

204. *Reply to an address by the Kanpur Municipality, 20 August 1923*<sup>1</sup>

I thank you for the very kind sentiments you have expressed in the address just read out. You have referred to my early career as a student and at the bar. You have rightly said that the city of Cawnpore is as much mine as it is yours. I may tell you that there still exist in Cawnpore places which were, in the words of the poet, 'seats of my youth, when every sport could please.' Your reference to those days revives happy memories of the pleasant past. That was a happy dream which, alas ! has now passed away and we are face to face with solid facts and stern realities of life. In facing these we have pursued our own ways which may differ from each other but are directed to the one end of doing our duty to the best of our ability.

You have given the first place to my success as a lawyer. I have no doubt attained a measure of success in my profession, but I do not think that it entitles me to the honour you have done me. Whatever professional success I may have achieved was in pursuit of filthy lucre and not meant as public service. You have also noticed the little service I have been able to render to the cause of practical social reform. Here again I may have done some little work while engaged mainly in my business and other things. The best of that also does not, in my judgement, deserve any public recognition. You are all aware of the one work of my life to which I hope to devote the remainder of my days. The only claim I can possibly have to your appreciation arises out of that work. But the prominent mention you have made of the fact that all of you may or may not see eye to eye with me in that connection deprives me of my sole title to public recognition.

When I arrived in Cawnpore I was only aware of your kind intention to honour. The address itself was shown to me in proof only a few minutes ago. At first I felt myself placed in an awkward position but did not hesitate long in making up my mind to accept the honour you proposed to confer on me. The reason was that you as representatives of the people were honouring me on their behalf and I had no manner of doubt that the heart of dear old Cawnpore was sound.

I know that most of those you represent do see eye to eye with me and I see their feelings between the lines of your address and not in the words used in it. You see the mark of their appreciation painted in sandal on my forehead just as I was entering that hall. Besides, I assume that most, if not all, of you do see eye to eye with me, for if that were not so you and I would not have been here this evening.

There is another aspect of the matter which calls for the expression of my

<sup>1</sup>*The Leader*, 22 August 1923.



gratitude to you personally and not merely as representatives of the people of Cawnpore I have to thank you for the generous rule adopted by you to honour those with whom you do not see eye to eye, and I take it that the same rule has been applied in the previous addresses presented by you, as you are aware it has in the past been the practice of municipal boards to honour only high officials with addresses. That was the invariable rule without the least regard to any special claim of the official concerned. It was first departed from in these provinces by the municipal board of Allahabad which honoured a non-official to whom honour was due, I mean Deshbandhu C.R. Das. Other municipalities have since made similar departures from the old practice. Bareilly and Lucknow have recently honoured me and I now stand before you at your invitation to receive the same generous treatment for which I thank you.

### *205 Election Manifesto of the Swaraj Party, 14 October 1923<sup>1</sup>*

The principles and policy to be followed by the Swarajya Party on its entry into the Legislative Assembly and the Provincial Councils have been sufficiently indicated in the programme of the Party published in February last. The relevant part of that programme is given below and it is only necessary to explain certain points and deal with certain aspects which the events of the last eight months have brought into prominence.

It will be convenient at the outset to make the position of the Swarajya Party in relation to the Indian National Congress perfectly clear. It was declared at the earliest possible opportunity that it was a party within the Congress and as such an integral part of the Congress. It is not and was never intended to be a rival organisation and its promoters have always kept in view the essential principles of Non-violent Non-co-operation as they understand them. This position has now been made clear by the resolution of the recent Special Session of the Congress which while affirming those essential principles affords full opportunity of service to Congressmen who believe in carrying the good fight into the enemy's camp by entering the Councils. It was our earnest desire to arrive at a settlement which would render it unnecessary to continue the separate organization of the Party by incorporating it into the Congress as one of its various departments and subjecting it to the control of the general Congress Executive. But this desire could not be fulfilled in view of the terms of the compromise finally agreed upon and confirmed by the Special Session. It is obviously impossible to carry out the object in view without an effective organization to control the proceedings of Congressmen who go into the Councils. The Swarajya Party must therefore continue to function as was clearly understood throughout the negotiations which ended so happily in the compromise adopted by the Congress. It need hardly be pointed out that the only right course open to Non-co-operators who have so far opposed Council entry and now desire to avail of the permission accorded by the Congress is to join the

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers (S4791).

Swarajya Party and subject themselves to its discipline. Any other course would not only be inconsistent with the spirit of the compromise but would defeat the very object with which it was sanctioned by the Congress. It is the first and the foremost duty of the Swarajya Party to guard the honour and prestige of the Congress in and out of the Councils and it cannot approve the conduct of those non-co-operating Congressmen who did not favour Council-entry before the resolution of the Delhi Special Congress and are now setting themselves up as independent candidates without agreeing to submit to any discipline. Such conduct can only bring discredit on the Congress and the so-called independents cannot but be treated by the Party as outsiders. What they are doing is in effect counter propaganda against the Party which is the very thing the Congress resolution was intended to avoid. It is hoped that they will receive no countenance from the Working Committee of the Congress.

The Swarajya Party believes that the guiding motive of the British in governing India is to serve the selfish interests of their own country and that the so-called Reforms are a mere blind to further the said interests under the pretence of granting responsible government to India, the real object being to continue the exploitation of the unlimited resources of the country by keeping Indians permanently in a subservient position to Britain and denying them at home and abroad the most elementary rights of citizenship. It is daily becoming abundantly clear that the British while professing equality of treatment are in practice subjecting the whole Indian Nation to humiliation and insult in all parts of the world where British influence is supreme. The Party notes with pride and satisfaction that the people of India are resolved to submit no longer to the national humiliation imposed upon them by the autocratic will of their British rulers and in full concurrence with the Congress expresses its emphatic opinion that Indians have no option but to continue to carry on a policy of progressive Non-violent Non-co-operation with the present system of Government until it is radically changed in accordance with the will of the people expressed through their chosen representatives.

Whilst the Swarajya Party is convinced that it is absolutely necessary to keep in view the various stages of Non-co-operation and believes that by entering into the Legislative bodies it will materially help the general campaign of Non-co-operation, it realises at the same time that there are true nationalists in the country who without agreeing with the principles of Non-co-operation are in sympathy with the Party programme so far as it relates to Councils. With such nationalists the Party has no quarrel. It is open to them if they sign the Congress creed to join the Council Section of the Party without identifying themselves with the activities of Non-co-operators outside the Councils by giving the requisite undertaking required by the Party from all its members who stand for election. A country engaged in freedom's battle must mobilize all available forces and a national soldier fit to serve in the National Army need not be discarded simply because he is unfit or unwilling to serve in the National Navy and Air Force as well. He must, however, submit himself to the discipline of the particular department of the national organization which he elects to enter. It will be observed that the words used in Art. V of the Programme of the Party copied below are "Nationalist candidates" and not "Party members as candidates". Any nationalist who subscribes to the creed of

the Congress and to the Council policy of the Party can therefore be set up by the Party as its candidate and will not thereby become a member of the Party for any other purpose. He will however be bound by all the rules which may be framed by the Party to regulate the conduct of Party members of the Councils. Some misapprehension exists in the public mind as to the exact nature of the Congress creed which an intending candidate who is not already a member of the Congress is expected to sign. It is nothing more than "the attainment of Swarajya by the people of India by all legitimate and peaceful means" and has no reference whatever to Non-co-operation which the Congress has adopted by resolutions passed at its periodical and special sessions, such resolutions being no part of the creed. The form of the undertaking required is given below.

In the published programme the immediate objective of the Party is stated to be "the speedy attainment of full dominion status" which is explained to mean "the right to frame a constitution adopting such machinery and system as are most suited to the conditions of the country and the genius of the people." It is essential for the self-realization of a people to be free to exercise their natural and inherent right to determine and adopt a system of government most suited to their civilization and their cherished traditions. When such a system has been fully evolved it cannot be very different from the Swarajya which is the ultimate goal of nationalist India. The immediate objective of the party must necessarily be something falling short of complete Swarajya and it is therefore referred to in the programme as the securing of the *right to frame a constitution* as distinguished from the *fully evolved constitution* itself. The words "dominion status" are used in their well-understood technical sense to convey a definite idea of the nature of the constitution to the minds of English statesmen and jurists and are not intended to mean any special form of government established in any particular dominion. It is evident that before the old order of things can give place to the new the authors of the new order must have an effective control of the old. In other words, as a necessary preliminary to the right to frame their own constitution of Swarajya the people of India must obtain an effective control of the existing machinery and system of Government. To remove all doubt and speculation in the matter the Swarajya Party therefore declares that it will contest the forthcoming elections on the broad basis of the incontestable right of the people to secure such effective control. It will not concern itself with trivial reforms in the various departments of the administration to be obtained by the grace of the Government but will insist on a transference of the power to effect the necessary reforms from the bureaucracy to the people themselves. Long lists of grievances have been set forth in the election manifestoes of certain parties and individuals but the means suggested for their redress have no fascination either for the Swarajya Party or, as it firmly believes, for the people of India. The Swarajya Party will not lay itself out to secure famine rations for the politically famished people of India but will devote all its energy to provide them with a feast of substantial rights of citizenship which is their due. On questions like the salt tax certification and the Kenya betrayal the Party has no faith in halting measures of the nature suggested in certain quarters but believes in the complete eradication of a system which makes such atrocities possible as the only remedy. Under exist-

ing conditions the Party considers it an abuse of the suffrage of an Indian electorate on the part of its representatives to engage in such questions as the readjustment of the powers and duties of the Secretary of State, the Government of India, the Provincial Governments, and various other officials. The Swarajya Party maintains that the powers those functionaries exercise vest in the people by right and can only be properly exercised by their representatives.

The demand to be made by the members of the Party on entering the Legislative Assembly will therefore in effect be that the right of the people of India to control the existing machinery and system of Government shall forthwith be conceded and given effect to by the British Government and the British Parliament. It is no answer to this demand to say that the Government of India has no power under the Act to entertain it. We know it has not and we do not ask it to find some power within the four corners of the Act to deal with it. It has indeed nothing whatever to do with the forms prescribed for resolutions, or other motions or with the Act itself. We take the position of the Government of India to be precisely what the late Lord Morley said it was *viz.* that of an agent of the British Cabinet. The demand will be addressed to the principal through the accredited agent as soon as practicable after the results of the elections are declared and before the Legislative session begins, in such manner and form as the elected members of the Party may determine. It will in its nature be an offer of certain terms which it will be for the agent to accept or refuse on behalf of the principal or take such other action thereon as he may be advised.

The attitude of the elected members of the Party in the Assembly and the Councils will depend on the action taken by the Government on the demand formulated by them on the lines indicated above. If the right itself is conceded it will be a matter for negotiation between the Government and the Nationalist members in the Assembly as to the manner in which the right is to be given effect to. But in the event of the Government refusing to entertain the said demand or after agreeing to do so offering terms which are not acceptable it shall be the duty of members of the Party elected to the Assembly and the Provincial Councils, if they constitute a majority, to resort, in the words of the Party Programme, to a policy of "*uniform continuous and consistent obstruction with a view to make government through the Assembly and the Councils impossible.*" The objection that the Government will not have sufficient time between the date on which the demand is made and the opening Session of the Legislature to consider it is met by the publication of this manifesto which indicates clearly the essential features of the demand and copies of which are being forwarded to the India Office and the Government of India. There is ample time between now and January 1924 for the Government to be prepared to make up its mind at least as to whether it will dismiss the demand summarily or try to arrive at a settlement. In the former case the course to be adopted by the Party members of the Assembly and the Councils has been clearly indicated above. In the latter it will be easy to arrange the terms and conditions on which the negotiations are to proceed.

The Swarajya Party desires to make it quite clear to the other political parties in the country and the people at large that it is pledged to obstruction

against the Government and not against any other party in the Legislature. It will not be inconsistent with its principles to support a non-official measure introduced by any other party or group of members if such measure is opposed by the Government. It shall also be always open to members of the Party to accept on such terms and conditions as are likely to promote the general policy of the Party, a *bonafide* invitation from any other party or group of members of the Legislature to join the latter for the purpose of defeating the Government on any non-official measure opposed by the Government, or on an official measure opposed by the inviting party or group of members. In the event of the members of the Swarajya Party being in a minority they will accept such invitation only when they form a majority of the Legislature concerned along with the inviting party or group of members. The Swarajya Party expects all other parties and elected Indian members in the Assembly or the Councils to support it whole-heartedly in the initial demand set out above and to that end invites their assistance and co-operation in formulating and presenting it. Indeed it is impossible to conceive that there can be any serious differences between true nationalists to whichever party they may belong as to the general attitude they ought to take in the Assembly and the Councils towards a system of Government which stands wholly discredited in the eyes of all classes of Indians.

The agriculturist of India needs no assurance of the unswerving loyalty of the Swarajya Party to his cause. He is the backbone of the country and the mainstay of the whole Congress movement. It has now been fully demonstrated that he believes in the Congress and the Congress believes in him. The Swarajya Party would miserably fail in its primary duty if it did not make the betterment of his deplorable condition its first and foremost concern. It is a happy sign of the times that he is fully convinced that his salvation does not lie in the temporary benefits which a "benign" Government is likely to confer or well-meaning friends are expected to gain. He believes in Swarajya as the only remedy for his many ills and knows that his party is the party which strives for nothing short of Swarajya. The case with the landowning classes is however different and it has to be noted with regret that the tongue of slander has of late been more than usually busy to estrange them from the Swarajya Party. All sorts of fanciful stories are being circulated to the prejudice of the Party. The Swarajya which the Party aims at is represented as something which has no place whatever for this ancient order the members of which have in the past furnished many a brilliant chapter to the history of the country and even in these degenerate days have a number of ardent nationalists among them. The Party can only appeal to these latter to set at rest the doubts and misgivings of their less enlightened brethren by explaining to them the obvious fact that those who desire to help in the building up of Swarajya cannot possibly dream of such madness as to undermine the very foundations of society as it has existed for hundreds of years in India by trying to eliminate an important and influential class from it. True it is that the Party stands for justice to the tenant but poor indeed will be the quality of that justice if it involves any injustice to the landlord. The Party believes that it is only by serving the true interests of both that it can find a solid basis for Swarajya and is pledged to stand by the one as firmly as by the other in its hour of need. It welcomes

nationalist zemindars who intend contesting the elections as comrades in arms if they will only agree to avail of the many opportunities for co-operation with the Party which they are bound to have within the limitations of their well known disabilities. As has already been stated the Swarajya Section of the Party is open to all who will satisfy the very simple conditions to which no true nationalist can have any possible objection. For reactionaries whether they are zemindars or others the Party has no sympathy whatever.

There are certain other points which have formed the subject of enquiry but it is obviously impossible to go into further details in this manifesto. Much will depend upon the circumstances which will arise after the elections are over. It will then be for the elected members to decide what course to adopt keeping in view the principles of Non-violent Non-co-operation. The Party hopes and trusts that its Members will be resourceful enough to meet all eventualities.

These are the broad lines of work which the Party has laid out for itself. How far it will meet with success depends on the support it receives from the public in general and the electorates in particular. As is well known it starts on the campaign with a heavy handicap. Many of its best men have been disqualified by the Government from voting or standing for election for no other crime than the love of their country. Crippled as it has thus become it has only had a free hand in the matter of the forthcoming elections since the last Special Session of the Congress. Many other influences have been at work against it which it is needless to enter into as the Party knows no going back when it has once entered the field and will fight to the last man if the country will accept its services. It does not admit that any of its members has really lost the privilege of seeking the suffrage of his countrymen and will set up some of them as its candidates in spite of the disqualification unjustly imposed upon them. By doing so the Party offers the Government an opportunity to remove those disqualifications and make the elections a fair test of the real feeling in the country. But if the Government which boasts of having conceded a substantial measure of responsible Government to the people of India cannot have the courage to admit men of tried merit and undoubted patriotism into the Legislatures of the country it stands self-condemned. The Party fully trusts that the people will stand by it in electing its candidates and thereby helping to expose the fraud practised during the last three years in their names. Detailed instructions in this behalf will follow.

Motilal Nehru  
General Secretary  
Swarajya Party

Anand Bhawan,  
Allahabad.  
Oct. 14th 1923

206. *A Notice from Swaraj Party*<sup>1</sup>

As already announced a meeting of the General Council of the Swaraj Party of the Indian National Congress will be held on Saturday, the 29th December 1923, in the Subjects Committee Hall, Gandhinagar at 5.30 p.m.

All the Swarajist members of the All India Congress Committee are reminded that they are members of the General Council of the Party. Those who have not already got themselves enrolled as such can do so now in the office of the Party.

Admission to the meeting of the General Council will be by ticket which will be issued to members on application at the office. Those who have not paid their subscriptions will kindly do so when applying for tickets.

Motilal Nehru  
General Secretary

Cocanada  
26.12.23

207. *Resolution at Cocanada Congress, 29 December 1923*<sup>2</sup>

Read the draft of Indian National Pact and the Bengal National Pact.

Resolved that the Committee appointed by the Delhi session of the Congress do call for further opinions and criticism and submit further report by the 31st of March 1924 to the All India Congress Committee for its consideration, and Sirdar Amar Singh Jhabbal<sup>3</sup> be included in the place of Sirdar Mehtab Singh<sup>4</sup> who is now in Jail.

208 *Speech at Cocanada Congress, 29 December 1923*<sup>5</sup>

Sirs,

The meaning of the resolution is that after going through the Indian

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Report of the Thirty-eighth session of the Indian National Congress, Cocanada, 1923.

<sup>3</sup>Amar Singh Jhabbal; b. 1888; joined Congress in 1919; President, District Congress Committee, Amritsar; member, S.G.P.C., 1921; Acting President, S.G.P.C., 1922; President Central Sikh League, 1923; resigned from National Pact Committee, April 1924; started a weekly, *Desh Bhagat* in 1924; arrested in 1924 and several times later on; President, Punjab P.C.C., 1927; a 'dictator' of Akali Dal, 1933-36; d. 1962.

<sup>4</sup>Sardar Bahadur Mehtab Singh; b. 1879; Bar-at-law; started practice at Shahpur in 1910; was given the title of Sardar Bahadur; Deputy President, Punjab Legislative Council, 1920, resigned in November 1921; member, S.G.P.C., 1921 and President, 1922; imprisoned, 1923-26; formed Sikh Missionary Society and established Sikh Missionary College at Amritsar, 1927, d. 1939.

<sup>5</sup>Report of the Thirty-eighth session of the Indian National Congress, Cocanada, 1923. Speech delivered in Hindi in support of his resolution.

National Pact as well as another Pact drafted separately for Bengal, this Congress resolves that the National Pact prepared by the Committee which was entrusted with that work should be treated as the opinion of the country, that it should be resubmitted to the people for further opinions, that in the light of these opinions the Committee should submit another report to the All-India Congress Committee before the 31st of March 1924, and that Sirdar Amar Singh Jhabbal be included in the place of Sirdar Mehtab Singh who is now in Jail as a political prisoner.

Sirs, it is with much regret that I speak before you and I cannot describe to you in words what shame I feel at heart in moving this resolution. This resolution reminds you of the lack of union that has been the misfortune of this country not for some years but for many years. I feel shame and sorrow at this. Alas! Is it the fate of our country that there should be written agreement to establish good relations between brother and brother? Should there be such an agreement between neighbour and neighbour? Should there be a resolution that it is necessary for a committee to sit and inquire through the whole country? It is such a regrettable thing. If you observe, you will understand the feelings that agitate my mind while moving this resolution. But, what to do? Such things are inevitable when troubles arise. Troubles have arisen; disunion has set in; quarrels are going on everywhere. And, in order to put a stop to these quarrels this should be done and such attempts should be made.

A brother of mine has inquired if I read the Indian National Pact and the Bengal Pact. I assure you, I have not myself read either. However, I have stood before you to move this resolution. Why? The reason is the same as that which generally guides the relationship between brothers. Until this Pact was actually printed, it did not strike me why there should be any pact, any committee, and any resolution before a conference. My head recognises the necessity but my heart does not feel it.

On the whole, it does not matter what kind of draft, pact or compact it is, whether it is prepared by the Congress or by the Bengal Committee; every individual is not bound to support it. But, first of all, I must say that it was not intended to bind every Hindu, Muhammadan, Christian, Parsi or Jew, when the Delhi session of the Congress resolved that a Committee should prepare a draft for removing the religious differences between the Hindus and Mussalmans and for securing good relations between them. You may ask what this Committee was instructed to do. It was asked to prepare a good draft. The purpose was that the draft should go round the whole country, be examined and after completion placed before the Congress. All the people assembled there have the right to examine the same and decide whether they agree to it or not. The Bengal Congress Committee also prepared a similar draft and published it. But unfortunately, misunderstandings have arisen about this pact throughout the whole country and particularly the Punjab and the province to which I belong. I have now received hundreds of telegrams from various persons and places containing complaints as to the right of Bengal to bind the Hindus and the Mussalmans by its resolution. I admit, Bengal herself admits, my friend Deshabandhu Das admitted and nobody doubts it, that, whether it be the Congress or any province, it has not the authority to say that there should necessarily be this pact or agreement bet-



ween you and me so long as we do not agree to it. A defendant can never be compelled to compromise against his will anywhere in the world. This is simply a draft in name; it cannot as yet be said to be complete.

You are now met here to decide whether the Bengal Pact can be accepted or not. You may or may not accept it; but where is the necessity for so much hubbub? You may at once realise the position when I tell you that able men have expressed their opinion that this is a mere draft placed before the country for its criticism. It has become so far necessary to inform you as to the issue about the pacts. There is not a word in the Bengal Pact, that seeks to affect the Hindus, the Mussalmans and other people of any part of India. Please forget all this and see what objection you can have for this and what words you propose in the place of these words. That is why the matter has been placed before the whole country. It is clear from this resolution that the report prepared by the Committee, appointed at Delhi is not final. Dr. Ansari, one of the members of the Committee, circulated copies of the draft to 80 or 90 of us and also to public bodies inviting criticism thereon. Only 8 replied; many were indifferent. Do you think that it is possible to decide finally from the opinions of only eight people a subject of such vast importance as the relations between the Hindus and the Mussalmans, nay, a subject on which the whole problem of Swaraj rests?

I have stood before you without having looked at either the Indian National Pact or the Bengal Pact. It is not for me to say which of them is good or which bad. Every Hindu or Mussalman of this country has the right to say it. That is why I am standing here without having seen the same. Suffice it to say that a subject of such magnitude has not been given that attention which should be bestowed on it. Nothing has yet been done on the report of the Committee of the Congress nor was there full discussion even in the Working Committee. You will agree with me that both the Indian National Pact and the Bengal Pact should be placed before the country and opinions should be invited thereon from some persons and a fresh report of the Committee be drawn up in the light of these opinions and submitted to the All-India Congress Committee for consideration. And in order to avoid all future difficulties, the All-India Congress Committee should give a final decision after full deliberation.

When that report comes before you, you may understand that you may oppose it if you will. I will now tell you one thing more. Dr. Ansari, Lala Lajpat Rai and Sirdar Mehtab Singh were the members of the first Committee. If Lala Lajpat Rai's health is not good, Pundit Madan Mohan Malaviya should work in his place. Sirdar Mehtab Singh is now in Jail in connection with the big Akali struggle now going on in Amritsar. He cannot therefore work in the Committee and Sirdar Amar Singh Jhabbal is appointed in his place.

The Bengal Pact is not a pact at all. We may consider the draft in this way. Many of the people of Bengal are there and Deshabandhu is one of them. This resolution was passed by them and submitted for your approval. You can therefore allow this resolution so far as you are concerned without any discussion. Countless telegrams were received only to this effect, viz., that this pact should not be finally approved. Leaving aside the telegrams received at home there is no limit to the number of telegrams received within the past ten

minutes. The Telegraph Office could not have received so much income from any other source. So much of the country's money is wasted.

I have to tell you two words more. Now, you may be surprised at this unmethodical compulsion. Let it be any draft or pact. But I will be doing you a great injustice, if I do not tell you clearly, my views upon this Pact. I can say from what I have seen in the Punjab, the United Provinces and some other parts of the country, that some purpose can be served by this Pact. But if you want to attain Swaraj and Hindu-Muslim unity should depend on such pacts, then those who love Swaraj should wash their hands clean of it since it would take them back to thousands of years.

Sirs, that kind of love is not proper which comes out of agreements that say: beat drums at a particular time, do this work at a particular hour and not do another work at another hour. Hearty love flows from the heart itself and not otherwise. But leave it alone. When the Hindus and the Mussalmans are in the same trouble and when the same path leads them to salvation although they happen to be enemies, which man of common sense will say nay to it? None will say that there is any path but Hindu-Muslim unity for those who desire to destroy slavery and attain Swaraj.

If you want to continue to quarrel amongst yourselves, please say that you do not want Swaraj. Otherwise, open your hearts for each other. What is the good of this fraud, this useless expenditure and these annual gatherings? My last appeal to you is not to waste time. I will now tell you a story. I was travelling in the train. A Punjabi brother told me, "You are reputed to be an able Advocate; do you believe that it is possible that the Hindus and the Mussalmans will ever unite?" I replied, "Am I touring throughout the country for any other purpose than the attainment of Swaraj and the removal of slavery?" He admitted that my idea was right and that I was trying for the same. I asked him again if Swaraj could be attained by any other means than Hindu-Muslim unity. He exclaimed it was not possible. I asked if I was a mad man to roam about. Certainly, I should be! If a forest is on fire, even the wild beasts run about and gather together in one place both the deer and the tiger that eats it. Then, is the Hindu-Muslim unity impossible?

Please accept this resolution. No report would drop from the heavens which would effect a compromise between the Hindus and Mussalmans and make them embrace one another. Please unite with one another. I hope you will do so.

#### 209. *Speech at Cocanada Congress, 29 December 1923*<sup>1</sup>

I do not take much of your time to reply to the debate. I place this resolution before you with much regret. With great diffidence I do so. I am sorry to say that the main theme of the opposition speeches can be traced to the estrangement that rankles in the hearts of both the communities. This has been thought of as a remedy to drive away the animosity that is existing

<sup>1</sup>Report of the Thirty-eighth session of the Indian National Congress, Cocanada, 1923.

between brothers. What is the reason for the division among them? And what is the bond of agreement that brings them together? With regard to the contention that the word "Bengal" should be deleted I have nothing more to say than to place before you one or two statements advanced by my brother, Deshabandhu Das. What is the meaning in Bengal speaking out her opinion? Don't you know that the Bengal Congress Committee passed a resolution and that it was published in all papers? That resolution was communicated by proper authority to the All India Congress Committee. What is it that you take exception to in that pact? Eloquent speeches urging the deletion of the word "Bengal" are delivered by my brothers. Is Bengal an untouchable to be ashamed of? [The] Bengal Congress Committee, rightly or wrongly, introduced a subject before you for consideration. You may or may not accept it. Whether accepted or not, has not every delegate assembled here got the right to record his opinion on the matter? If an individual has got such a right, is not a province entitled to place its views before you either for your acceptance or rejection? Brothers, I am most surprised to hear Mr. Yakub Hasan saying that if this pact was placed before the country, other parts of India might demand the same as was granted in Bengal. I ask him, do they not demand the same if the word 'Bengal' is omitted? Who in the whole of India does not know about this pact? In which paper was it not published? But people did not understand it and are therefore opposing it. If you omit this word, it will be understood, not only by Bengal but all, that the Congress is not prepared to give even a hearing to any part of India that gives greater rights to the Muhammadans that inhabit that part. Let the Bengal pact be right or wrong, but we hear much was given and that so much ought not to be given. From this it should not be inferred that the Congress is being asked to give similarly. But it has asked the Congress to hear and think about it. It is bound by your decision just as the smaller committee is subordinate to the bigger committee. That is why you are removing the word Bengal. What I want to impress upon you is this, that if you pass an amendment to omit the word 'Bengal' or reject the resolution in toto, you will be doing immense harm to the Congress movement. If everything were clear and if the question whether there should be or should not be a pact at all had arisen in the beginning, as I have told you in my opening speech, I should never have stood up in support of this resolution. But this is not the first time and events have marched a good deal. We should consider coolly what we have to do. All matters are finished and no new things happen to-day! This resolution was passed in December 1922. This began with the resolution of the Working Committee of December 1922. I am now reading to you the resolution adopted by the Subjects Committee.

"This Congress resolves that the following gentlemen be appointed to prepare a draft of the National Pact, to circulate it for opinion among the leading representatives and influential persons of different communities in the country and after consideration of the opinion received to submit their report to the All-India Congress Committee for disposal at the Cooanada Congress".

Afterwards this was brought before the Delhi Congress. From December 1922 till now we did not hear a single voice speaking against the resolution. After all has happened and after the report is ready it is now proposed to annihilate it. Instead of giving new hope to the depressed, you are pulling down

even the hopeful. Instead of winning confidence you are frustrating the attempts made in that direction. The result, as all people know, is this. Bengal Muhammadans think they have gained something and the Hindus think they have lost something of their rights. What does a man with a cool judgement do when he sees one opinion ranging on one side and another on another side? Shall we leave them to themselves? Or shall we try to unite them by persuasion? We should try to unite them. I want to convince you. My friends may say what they like in their speeches. But for the last forty years I have been engaged in settling the disputes between the Hindus and Mussalmans. Not one, but hundreds of disputes have I helped to solve. These quarrels do not fetter the freedom of our tongue. All parties will be given proper hearing. Speeches were made with regard to telegrams. The telegrams contain that haste should be avoided in coming to a decision and that all people and associations concerned in the matter should be consulted and that a most careful consideration should be given to the subject. This has been fully done and the opinions of the country and the Sanghatan are being worked out. I am coming to a close. I humbly entreat brothers who want to amicably settle these disputes, that after return to their homes, they should explain to the people and enthuse them with this idea. Telegrams too contemplate that we should work after due deliberation.

*210. Speech at Cocanada Congress, 1 January 1924<sup>1</sup>*

This is the usual proposition which is proposed at the conclusion of a session of the Congress. But my experience of this resolution in previous Congresses has always been that if there is one resolution which all the delegates assembled passed whole-heartedly, it is this resolution. I have seen for the last few years that we assemble with feelings of doubt, with feelings of suspicion and we are not at all sure as to how we shall part. But it has been our good fortune in the past, so it has been at this Congress, though that element of doubt continued, you allow me to say that we are passing with the lightest of hearts and with full sympathies with our friends. I thank the volunteers of the Reception Committee on your behalf for the very kind attention they have paid to us and I endorse every word Mrs. Naidu had said before you. Indeed, I don't think I can speak so portentous as she has indulged in any figure of speech or in any poetical description, but any description would fall short of the real truth. The volunteers of the Reception Committee have done their duty so remarkably well that no praise can be so high to them. Speaking personally, for all the attention which my age and limitation require, I have seen there was not one voice of complaint raised by anybody as regards the arrangements of the Reception Committee and the willing services rendered by the volunteers. Now, I congratulate you, gentlemen, at this concluding hour of the Congress for having to part with your friends with the pleasure of love which you must have borne in your

<sup>1</sup>*Report of the Thirty-eighth session of the Indian National Congress, Cocanada, 1923.*  
Speech delivered in support of the resolution proposing vote of thanks.

heart, and all must carry

*211. Achievements of Swaraj Party, 13 April 1924<sup>1</sup>*

**A SOLEMN DUTY**

I appear before you to-night as a plain Swarajist member of the Assembly to discharge what I conceive to be a solemn duty. I know of no duty more solemn than that undertaken by one who seeks the suffrage of his countrymen and is chosen by them as their representative. Whatever the electorate that chose him his duty according to my conception extends to the public at large. This is more specially the case with a member of the Legislative Assembly who has to deal with all-India problems, and is therefore accountable to the people of India, as a whole and not merely to his own constituents. That being so, I stand before you to-night not as a casual visitor to your great city but as your humble servant bound to you by the huge obligations of faithful service as those I owe to my own constituents. It is both an honour and a pleasure to occupy that position. The only embarrassing part of it is, that one has to speak about his own work. I truly confess that I have had my share of this embarrassment. But two things have happened since my arrival in Bombay, which have in a great measure, eased the situation for me. The first was the advent of my friend Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, who has already treated you to one of these sumptuous feasts of eloquence for which he is so well-known. You have so recently enjoyed that feast to your heart's content that I can hope to make the much simpler fare that I can provide more or less acceptable to you. The other thing which has happened is, that I have had time to read some of the more important Press Comments on the Proceedings of the Assembly.

**PERSONAL COMPLIMENTS**

I have found no end of personal compliments paid to me, both by friendly and adverse critics. Some of these compliments are distinctly flattering, others extremely doubtful but compliments all the same. These Press Comments have revealed to me the comforting fact that I am the happy possessor of certain qualities which I was not aware of, before I read those comments. For instance, I am supposed to be not only a good party manager, but also a sort of a black magician who can, by a wave of his hand, get honest Nationalists, Liberals and Moderates to follow him into the lobby in spite of themselves and their own better judgment. I don't mind telling you that compliments like these have made me blush profusely. It was a good thing that I was all alone when I read them. I have now outlived those blushes in the delightful breezes of the

<sup>1</sup>Forward, 27 April 1924. Speech delivered in Bombay on the occasion of the anniversary of Jallianwala Bagh.

Juhu beach and appear before you today not only freed from all embarrassments on that score but with a distinct advantage for I find that instead of trying to take pains to impress you with my own part of the work done in the Assembly during the last session it is my plain duty to disillusion your mind of much that has been put to my credit.

### TRIBUTE TO COLLEAGUES

Believe me when I say, that my own part has been very small, and that whatever success has been achieved is mainly due to my colleagues, Swarajists and other Nationalists. And before I proceed further on this occasion of my first appearance on the public platform after the labours of the last session, I desire to publicly acknowledge not only the deep debt of gratitude I owe to the members of the Nationalist Party as a whole for their loyal and ungrudging support but all for the signal service to the country rendered by them in the respective spheres of work which fell to their lot. What I call signal service to the country is no doubt described in certain quarters as a distinct disservice. But of that later on. The Swarajists' work is splendidly shoulder to shoulder unflinchingly advancing from victory with a courage, zeal and determination which have deservedly earned for them a worldwide reputation. There are some, of course, who would say that it is a most unenviable reputation, but I value it and I know that you value it too. It was a high honour and a mark of the entire country's confidence to be unanimously selected as their leader, by such a devoted band of patriots coming from all parts of India. Almost all of them were tried soldiers of the invincible Non-co-operation army and many of them bore the marks of battle fought in other and very difficult fields under the leadership of that great leader of leaders Mahatma Gandhi. It required no unusual skill to lead such a gallant and disciplined force to victory. Those of you who know Persian, will remember the proverb which means "saints have no wings and cannot fly, their disciples give them wings and make them fly". If therefore, I flew at all, it was truly a case of flying with the wings of my colleagues. Then there were the other Nationalists. It is but a truism to say that without them the Swarajists would have been nowhere. The two combined have carried everything before them. The whole credit, therefore, belongs to the happy combination of the two, and all honours must be divided among them. It is a libel against the Non-Swarajist members of the Nationalist Party to say that they at any time, failed in their duty to the Party. There were no doubt occasional differences of opinion in our private consultations, as was only natural, in a party of 76, but when it came to action, the whole Party stood firm as a rock and carried out faithfully and honourably the behest of the majority.

### THE COMMON FACTORS

After this humble tribute to my colleagues, I will now refer briefly to the work done. Full details have been published from time to time and our worthy Chairman has today dealt with the salient features of the proceedings. It is

only necessary for me to show that we have strictly adhered to the programme we laid before our electors. Nagpur easily carries the palm in having fulfilled the programme, not only in spirit but also in the letter. All honour to the Swarajists of the Central Provinces. The next place of honour belongs to the Assembly, where it became possible to convert a minority into a solid majority by the help of some other Nationalists. There were supposed differences in principles and in methods but on closer examination it was found that these differences were merely those of detail. The central factors were common and around these clustered a number of divergent theories. There was perfect accord on the common factors which were:

- (1) A common National Demand;
- (2) Refusal of supplies, if there was no satisfactory response to the National Demand.

These were the only two things that mattered. Both parties were prepared to resort to the well-known method of refusing supplies as the only right thing to do if there was no satisfactory response on the part of the Government, the object in view of each party was no doubt different. While by such refusal the Swarajists aimed at making Government through the Assembly impossible, the other Nationalists merely wanted to draw pointed attention to the seriousness of our grievances. The act from which these different results were contemplated by the simple expedient of omitting from the programme all reference to the object in view. All controversy was thus set at rest, and what was the Swarajist minority of about the third of the total strength of the Assembly was at once converted into a majority

## THE ATTACK

You know what followed. A National Demand in complete accordance with the Swarajists' programme was formulated and presented by way of an amendment to a resolution asking for the establishment of Full Responsible Government in India.

That amendment was carried by the overwhelming majority of 76 to 42. We then waited for the response. It came at last, but turned out to be highly unsatisfactory. All was now ready for the first attack and it was delivered when the first four demands for grants came up for discussion. These as you know were rejected one after the other. Let us for the moment pause here and consider the effect of the refusal of these four grants. They related to customs, income tax, salt and opium. The money demanded was to run these departments which raised revenue on these heads. The meaning of the refusal to grant money to run these departments, was that there would be no agency to realise the revenue and when it is borne in mind that it is the revenue from these four sources which supplied the sinews of war to the Government of India, it will be easily understood that the vote of the Assembly was tantamount to paralysing the Government of India. That would of course be so only if the Government of India were bound by the vote of the Assembly, which is not the case in this country. The actual result therefore was simply this: From the Swarajist point of view, the Government was driven to carry

on by the exercise of its autocratic powers, and not by the vote of the Assembly, and from the point of view of other Nationalists, it was the most emphatic protest that could be lodged against the action of the Government. Both objects were rules governing free representative institutions. If applicable to this country the Government would have lain prostrate at the feet of the Assembly. It was saved only by its autocratic powers.

### THE CHIVALROUS COURSE

Now, I come to the second stage, which has been characterised as showing a great weakness on our part; I mean the attitude we took in relation to the remaining demands for grants. It was, of course, open to us to refuse them as we had done in the first four but we adopted a more chivalrous course. All the remaining grants put together could not suffice to run any considerable part of the machinery of the administration, civil or military. The refusal of these grants would therefore have amounted to a mutilation of the prostrate form which lay before us without materially improving the position. We refrained from this process of mutilation and allowed our soldiers to play a more innocent game. Some of them were anxious to show their capacity for dealing with the merits of the demands, and we allowed them to have their own way. Then came the final act in this drama or tragedy whatever you may call it. I mean the Finance Bill. At the call of the whips the soldiers rallied fresh and strong and fell into line again, for the final attack which however was not delivered till every precaution had been taken to cover a possible retreat in the event of some unexpected mishap. This was done by putting in a number of amendments reducing the various new taxes proposed in the Bill, while the main attack was to be directed against the Bill itself as a whole. The discussion of the amendments on the previous evening at our Party meeting put our friends of the Press off the scent, and they flashed messages across the country and 'he seas, informing the world that the Swarajists' attack on the Finance Bill was to take the form of amendments to clauses. Many of the Swarajists themselves were unaware that the main attack was to be delivered against the Bill itself. They were made to march as it were under sealed orders. Early next morning at 6 O' Clock Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya informed me of the readiness of the Non-Swaraj group of the Nationalist Party to take part in the main attack. Nothing could better please the Swarajists, who were spoiling for a big fight. The rally was sounded, and the Swarajists and Non-Swarajists cheerfully answered. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya led the attack by opposing the introduction of the Finance Bill. He dealt with the subject thoroughly and with his usual eloquence. Sir Malcolm Hailey then made a feeble stand against Malaviyaji's condemnation of the Government. This was followed by a short speech from me, and the next moment the Bill was thrown out by a majority. Thus ended the budget discussion but not the Finance Bill for it came back the next day with a recommendation from the Viceroy, to pass it with certain modifications. This was in effect a command which the Assembly was called upon to obey with a loaded pistol pointed at its head. The Government had taken steps to fill vacancies among its supporters and we had



the pleasure of seeing a Viceroy in the Assembly Chamber. I mean the gentleman who was appointed in place of Mr. K.C. Roy absent on deputation to England. When and how Mr. Roy resigned his seat, whether by wire from Bombay or by wireless from mid-ocean was not explained. These expedients however did not succeed. A faint murmur of "Aye" was heard from the Treasury Benches followed by the roar of "Nos" from various other parts of the Assembly Chamber and the Finance Bill was finally laid to rest, so far as the Assembly was concerned.

### BIG JACK HORNERS

The only available course left to the Government was, to have the Bill passed by the Council of State as certified by the Viceroy. This as you are aware is the most accommodating chamber to the Government. It is composed mostly of highly complicated gentlemen with elaborately decorated and inordinately long handles at either end of their names, gentlemen full of wise saws and distinguished names. These sapient sayings, read long homilies to reckless Swarajists of the Assembly and testified to their own statesmanship and responsibility, by passing the Bill as recommended by His Excellency. It was a pitiable sight to see these men of light without leading, allowing themselves to be used as tools by the Government. Their one great argument was, the very obvious one, namely no Government could be carried on without revenue, and therefore responsible Councillor could dream of such a folly as the refusal of supplies. They were completely oblivious of the fact that there was not an atom of responsibility entrusted to them by the Government. It is amazing how totally devoid of imagination, these distinguished gentlemen must be not to realise, that they were in no way more responsible for the budget of the Government of India than they were for the budget of the Government of Russia or that of Japan. They remind me of the nursery rhyme concerning the exploits of little "Jack Horner". In case some of you have forgotten these celebrated lines, I shall repeat them. The rhyme runs as follows:—

Little Jack Horner  
Sat in a corner,  
Eating the Christmas pie  
He put in his thumb  
Drew out a plum

And said "What a good boy Am I,"

These big Jack Horners sitting round the corner in Metcalfe House, were giving the Finance Bill Pie, thickly crusted over by Viceregal certification. Each one of them, put in his thumb, drew out a plum in the shape of a compliment from the Treasury Bench and on passing the Bill exclaimed "What a good boy am I" The Swarajists did their work differently. They did what His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief subsequently advised the Government members to do, namely "fight, fight hard, fight clean and fight to the finish".

charts and plans before the campaign begins. The party is going to meet on the 25th April, and the exact course to be followed will then be laid down. A meeting of the whole Nationalist Party will then be held subsequently and then plans will be finally considered and confirmed. Meanwhile you may rest assured that whatever line of action we may pursue, we shall in the words of the Commander-in-Chief continue to "fight, fight hard, fight clean, and fight to the finish."

### NON-SWARAJIST MEMBERS

In this connection I have a word to say to my Non-Swarajist friends. What they have to look at is the precise act in which they are called upon to join the Swarajists and not the words and phrases usually associated with that act such as obstruction, destruction, wrecking etc. I am no stickler for words, so long as we can act together it is wholly immaterial to me, how our action is described. They have already seen that we are not the wild animals we are supposed to be. The reactionary press will leave no stone unturned to estrange them from us. I beg them not to be misled by its ravings, but to refer all their doubts and difficulties to us and thus they will readily find satisfactory solution. I hear of new parties being started. No possible good can come out by multiplying parties.

### DR. GOUR

My friend, Dr. Gour, is reported by the press to have formed a new party, with the special object of opposing the so-called obstructive tactics of the Swarajists. I am not prepared to believe this, unless I have it directly confirmed by Dr. Gour. This gentleman owes his seat in the Legislative Assembly to the support of the Swarajists. He came to the Nationalist Party and asked for admission, but with the reservation that he was opposed to the obstruction mentioned in the programme of the party. He was told that if he wanted admission into the party, he would have to delete that reservation. Dr. Gour then scored out the words containing the reservation with his own hand in the open meeting. Dr. Gour is an honourable man, and I do not believe that he has now formed a party of 29 adherents with the avowed object of opposing the very programme which he ultimately agreed to. I do hope that he has not followed the advice given by Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer (a nominated member and one of the few title holders we have in the Assembly). He told the Non-Swarajist members in the Assembly that it was more honourable to break the pledge they had given to their Swarajist friends than to abide by it in the matter of the budget. I don't remember his very words, but that in effect was the opinion he expressed on Council morality.

### FIGHT TO THE FINISH

I have now done. This is the whole story. We do not pretend to have accomplished our task. We have done little. But what is that little? On this solemn occasion of the anniversary of the Jallianwala, I put it to you in all humility, whether we have not created a crisis such as the Government has

never been confronted with before. We have not shed a drop of blood. We have not crawled on our bellies. We have stood erect as men in asserting our birthright. We have made a brave show of *khaddar* in the citadel of the bureaucracy. We have planted the National Flag in the heart of the Council Chamber. We have driven the Government to cast off its mask of governing through the representatives of the people and have compelled it to carry on the administration by its own autocratic powers. Much more is yet to be done. Nothing can be achieved without the wholehearted support of our countrymen. But with you at our back, the might of the bureaucracy will be broken, and it will collapse like a house of cards. Will you extend that support to us? (several voices of "yes") Will you encourage us to finish the great fight we have begun? (repeated cries of "yes") I am glad of your answer. On our part we offer you our unswerving loyalty unto the death.

## 212. Criticism of the Government of India Act, 18 April 1924<sup>1</sup>

### INDIAN POLITICIANS CLASSIFIED

There are two classes of politicians in this country,—those who believe that their salvation lies with the British public and Parliament and those who believe that their salvation lies in their own hands. The proceedings held in Parliament last Tuesday, must have come with painful surprise to the former. It was however a matter of little concern to the latter. If anything, it is calculated to strengthen their resolve to rely upon themselves. It is needless to tell you, that the Moderates and Liberals are, among others, included in the former class of politicians, and that the Non-co-operators and Swarajists almost exclusively form the latter class.

### PIOUS PLATITUDES

Before I proceed further let me tell you, what has actually happened. I hold a newspaper report in my hand and will quote the exact words of the speeches where necessary. The Mother of Parliaments met, as you are aware, only day before yesterday. The debate was opened by Viscount Curzon who began by the pious statement that "The object of all was that India's position should not be weakened, but strengthened". And how was this strengthening to be brought about? The answer is, by giving a guarantee with regard to the services for at least a quarter of a century. The period of ten years contemplated by the Act for a change if necessary is thus quietly extended to a quarter of a century, for it must be borne in mind, that no change worth the name can be introduced into the Government of India without radical changes in the services. The next concern of the noble Viscount was for the 'infinitesimal proportion of unenfranchised citizens'. He said, "We could not divest ourselves of the responsibility to 98½ per cent of India's population, who are not enfranchised." Who on earth wishes them to be responsible even for 1 p.c. of India's population? The claim betrays utter ignorance of present day conditions in India.

<sup>1</sup>Forward, 25 April 1924. Speech at a public meeting in Bombay.

## ADULT FRANCHISE

The officials on the spot know that it will be suicidal to extend the franchise, because all India is at Gandhi's feet. Broadening the franchise means broadening Gandhi's influence in the Legislatures. And if this is done not a trace of the "saner elements" of the Government would be found anywhere in the Councils. We welcome the broadest possible franchise. It is the Government of India which has reason to dread it. I invite the Government to give us a general adult suffrage throughout the country. It will simplify our election campaign and reduce our election expenses. All that will then be necessary for the Swarajists would be to publish names of approved candidates, to address a few mass meetings and leave the rest to the country. They have at present the greatest difficulty in finding out two voters from among every hundred of the population.

## THE WILL OF INDIA

The noble Viscount then harped upon the well-known theme that the Government will not "depart from the letter or spirit of the Government of India Act." That is an obstinate insistence on the impossible. The Government of India Act must be laid aside if Parliament honestly means well by India. The preamble of the Act is a negation of the universally accepted principle of self-determination. It must go whatever else happens. The will of India and not the will of Parliament must determine the constitution. Unless this is conceded, there will be no peace of mind either in India or in England.

## THE CLOVEN FOOT

A few other speeches were made. I must here acknowledge that at least two Honourable Gentlemen, Messrs Scurr<sup>1</sup> and Hope Simpson<sup>2</sup> expressed clearer views (though not altogether unblurred) on the "unworkable failure" of dyarchy. Then came the weighty pronouncement of Professor Richards<sup>3</sup>, the Under Secretary of State, who began by formulating the question "whether the Government of India Act had broken down completely." He answered it by saying that before they could say that it had it was important that a "really

<sup>1</sup>John Scurr; b. 1876; active in labour movement; imprisoned, 1921, with 29 Poplar Councillors as a protest against unequal rate burdens; Chairman, Metropolitan Boroughs Standing Joint Committee, 1922-23, Mayor of Poplar, 1922-23; member, British Parliament, 1923-31; d. 1932.

<sup>2</sup>Sir John Hope Simpson; b. 1868, Joint Secretary, Board of Revenue, U.P., 1902; Registrar, Cooperative Credit Societies, U.P., 1904; President, Municipal Taxation Committee, U.P., 1908, member, British Parliament, 1922-24, Chairman, India Colonies Committee, 1924, Vice-President, Refugee Settlement Commission, Athens, 1926-30, d. 1961.

<sup>3</sup>Robert Richards; b. 1884, Lecturer in Political Economy at Cambridge University, Glasgow University, 1907-11; Lecturer in Economics, University College, Bangor, 1911-22; member, British Parliament, 1922-24 and 1929-31; Under Secretary for India, 1924, d. 1954.

generous attempt should be made to work it". Here again we see the cloven foot. The same old insistence on the Act which I have already dealt with. I should have thought that three years of working the Act that we have already seen would be enough for all practical purposes. The Under Secretary of State then referred to the enquiry by the Government of India into the shortcomings of the Act, "with the full concurrence of His Majesty's Government." In this enquiry he said, "Views of representative Indian politicians, who come to the Assembly in perfectly constitutional way to advocate modification of the constitution in regard to practical difficulties in the provisions of the Act, should be given full opportunity of constitutional expression." At this point, there was an interjection by a former Under Secretary of State, Earl Winterton. In reply to this, the present Under Secretary of State explained that he was referring to Indians "who were prepared to co-operate." I should have thought all members of the Assembly, Swarajists and Non-Swarajists, whether they went there to co-operate or non-co-operate had gone in a perfectly constitutional way. But the explanation given by Professor Richards would seem to exclude the Swarajists. This was taken advantage of by Earl Winterton, who quietly assumed in his reply that "those who oppose the Act would not be encouraged or allowed to give evidence".

### CONTACT AND PRESTIGE

But to go back to Professor Richards, he was at pains to discover in consultation with the Government of India how best to provide "opportunities of constitutional expression" and how to "establish contact with the elected representatives of the people." You might have heard of a rumour current in Bombay that the British Cabinet had invited Mahatma Gandhi and others to a conference in London. This rumour was stoutly denied in the House of Commons. I have no doubt that there was no truth in it. But the inventor of the rumour might be excused for imagining, that the only way to establish contact between the Cabinet and the leading public men in India, would be either for the former to come out to India, or for the latter to go over to London. It was the old story of Mohammed and the hill. In this case, the visit of the Cabinet to India being out of the question, it was perhaps thought, that the only possible way to establish contact was for some Indians to go to London. But the inventor of the story knew that these Indians would not go to London unless specially invited, and he therefore garnished it with the supposed invitation. But what is the difficulty in securing the desired contact? The parties are well-known and there are means of communication. The only thing that comes in the way is prestige. It is positively amazing to what absurd lengths practical men of business can go to propitiate this fetish.

### THE TWO ALTERNATIVES

After a few more speeches the motion before Parliament was talked out without leaving anybody the wiser for it. I have in my last speech explained the position of the Labour Government and the difficulties under which it is working. But we have little to do with the politics of English parties. What-

ever party is in power, the Cabinet in England and the Government in India have to make up their minds as to one of the two alternatives open to them. The first is, to take steps to help the people of India to establish their own Swaraj. These steps have been shown in the resolution adopted by the Assembly which suggests a process of natural evolution, and not a sudden or catastrophic change as is supposed in some quarters. Again the only thing that comes in the way is, the false idea of prestige. The other course is to revert to the old method, to cast off the sham of Reforms and honestly admit that Britain means to keep the country under her heel. There will then be a long drawn out struggle. The Government and the people will both suffer, but the latter will win in the long run. It is true that the people are not now ready to start at once on a general campaign of Satyagraha, but they have finally made up their minds, that this is the only course left to them.

### UNNATURAL AND INSULTING

And a day is sure to come sooner or later when the world will be startled by the determined effort put forth by the millions of men to obtain their freedom. They will go on preparing themselves. Meanwhile, we in the Assembly and in the Councils while remaining in the general movement, will play the game according to the rules laid down, until we have completely torn down the veil, and exposed the bare face of irresponsible autocracy. We shall never co-operate with the Government till it gives up the arrogant claim to make three hundred millions dance to the tunes set by it. The one condition precedent for co-operation, and even for establishing the much desired contact is that we must start on a clean slate. So long as the unjust, unnatural and insulting assumption contained in the preamble of the Act is allowed to hold good, so long will this point of contact be sought for in vain. The Government of India may hold its enquiry, cover reams of paper by the evidence of those interested in the working of the Act as it stands and send home formidable despatches based on that evidence. The British Cabinet may adopt the recommendations of the Government of India, either wholly or in part. The Mother of Parliaments may again and again talk out the Indian situation. All this may be done. But the situation will remain unchanged, unless and until the right of the people of India to frame their own constitution is fully conceded.

### TRICKS AND EXPEDIENTS

These, gentlemen, are the only alternatives honestly open to the Government. But instead of adopting either of these, it is taking a middle course in the hope that it will ultimately succeed in forcing the people to accept the Reform Act as it is, with all its implications. This it hopes to accomplish by discrediting the Swarajists and other Nationalists who have joined them in the eyes of the public. As I have already told you the Central Provinces Council has distinguished itself by acting on the Swarajist programme both in the letter and the spirit. Finding it impossible to retain the Ministers in office after the No-Confidence vote passed by the Council, the Governor of the C.P. has taken the administration of the Transferred Subjects into his own hands. This he can

do under the Act only temporarily. If Council Government is not to be abolished in the C.P. it is inevitable that a fresh general election should soon take place. To guard against the return of the Swarajists in larger numbers, the Government has adopted the expedient of refusing to restore such parts of the budget as were intended to effect improvements. For instance, the grants for new school buildings, new roads and other undertakings of a similar nature have not been restored. The Governor himself and his subordinates are carrying on a very energetic propaganda among the people, telling that they have to thank the Swarajist members whom they sent to the Council for being deprived of the improvements contemplated by the Government. One of the measures along with others rejected by the C.P. Council was a Bill consolidating the rules of Settlement of Land Revenue which among taken in hand for sometime to come (Sic). The C.P. Settlement Bill while it undoubtedly proposed to make the lot of the landholder and the tenant somewhat more bearable than it is at present, failed entirely to afford relief against the thousand and one troubles both of them suffer from. They know that the whole system of Revenue administration is rotten to the core, and that only a Swaraj Government can put it right. Again what does it matter to the people of Bengal if a few hundreds are added to the starving millions who have never had a full meal in the whole course of their lives. The manifesto of the Swaraj Party had fully prepared the people for all this, and the fact that they returned the Swarajists in large numbers clearly shows that they have done so with the full knowledge of the immediate inconveniences and the ultimate good that the hardships that they may have to undergo in the beginning are bound to bring in their train. I for one have no misgivings from this action of the Government and feel sure that when the time comes all the electorates in the country will give the Government a fitting answer by returning Swarajists in larger and larger numbers.

### THE HUGE FRAUD

We saw that the advice of Mahatmaji to boycott Councils in the manner in which he proposed was not fully adopted and that the Councils as at first constituted defeated the very object of the boycott. While on the one hand they did no good to the country on the other hand they demonstrated the capacity for mischief which was in them. The Government was enabled to take measures prejudicial to the interests of the people with the direct or indirect assent of their representatives. We know how the resolution for the release of Mahatmaji was defeated in the last Assembly by an overwhelming majority. The whole game of the Government was to carry on the administration of the country exactly as it had been carried on before the Reform Act came into operation and to use the Reform simply to hoodwink the world and make it appear that a substantial measure of responsible government had been conceded to the people of India. The principal object of the Swarajists in going to the Councils was to expose the hollowness of this claim and show to the world that the so-called Reforms gave no voice to the true representatives of the people in the actual administration of the country. I have heard my no-changer friends object that so far as this object is concerned the Swarajists have undertaken a

most unnecessary task, as there was no man, woman or child in the country who had any doubt in the matter. *They forget that the object was not merely to bring home to the people of this country that the Councils were a sham but to show to the world what their true nature was. They forget or perhaps are not aware of the fact that the British Government actually spends lakhs of Rupees on foreign other minor advantages provided much shorter terms of Settlement than those prevailing at present. It is now being dinned into the ears of landowners and agriculturists alike that the Swarajists so far from having in the least contributed to their welfare, have actually been instrumental in defeating beneficial measures. The same thing is being done in Bengal. Consequent on the cut in the educational grant the Government is going to dismiss some hundreds of schoolmasters. It is expected that those discontented will go among the people and prejudice them against the Swarajists. All tricks and expedients like these are doomed to failure.*

### THE PRICE OF SWARAJ

However unprepared the people may be to start a campaign of civil disobedience at the present time or in the near future, there is not the least doubt that that is the only means available to them to get at the true remedy for the evils they suffer from. They know that if they can ever hope to be within sight of Swaraj they must be prepared to suffer untold hardships. What does it matter to them that a few more new buildings for schools or new roads cannot be propaganda in America and other countries to justify British rule in India and convince the world that it is based on the free acquiescence of the people. These critics ignore altogether the world currents which are in perpetual motion. I shall give you one instance of the importance to India of making the truth known to the world. You all know of the boycott of the last visit of the Prince of Wales to this country resolved upon by the Indian National Congress with the advice of Mahatma Gandhi. In carrying out that boycott successfully it was found necessary by Mahatmaji to advise the breaking of the Criminal Law Amendment Act directed against the Congress and the Khilafat volunteers. Over thirty thousand patriotic workers cheerfully went to jail to make the boycott a success. Why was all this done? Simply, as Mahatmaji put it, to show to the world that the Prince of Wales was not being invited to visit their country by a contented people who approved of the Government under which they were placed. Was there any doubt in the mind of any man, woman or child in the country that there was widespread discontent and that the Government under which they lived was wholly disliked by them—the whole idea of the boycott of the Prince's visit and reference to its implications and effect on the outside world. If it was permissible to send thirty thousand of our brothers to jail for that one object, how much more necessary it is to disillusion the world from day to day as the administration of the country proceeds that the people of India have no control over it and that a huge fraud is being perpetrated on the world in their name? As I have already said this is not the only object which the Swarajists had in view. While they are there you need have no apprehension of the repetition of scenes like those witnessed in the last Assembly on the resolution about



Mahatmaji's release and on many a similar occasion. It is not necessary to repeat all our objects as they are fully set out in our manifesto. Every promise made in that manifesto will be fully and literally redeemed if we only continue to enjoy the support you have already given us. Meanwhile the real work of the country must proceed with unabated vigour. That work as you know consists of the restoration of Hindu-Muslim-Parsi-Christian unity, popularisation of Khaddar and the raising of the untouchables

### 213. Note on Council-entry<sup>1</sup>

I have read and re-read Mahatmaji's draft with all the attention I am capable of and have allowed a whole week to elapse since it was handed to me. I have also had the advantage in this interval of discussing the draft with Mahatmaji for which he was good enough to give me a long sitting of over three hours. I have considered the observations made by Mahatmaji in the course of that discussion with anxious care. This long deliberation has, I am sorry to say, resulted only in confirming the opinion I formed 18 months ago.

I agree that the difference between Mahatmaji and me is in some respects one of principle and not of mere detail. Indeed, on closer examination, I have come to think that it goes deeper and lies more in the theory on which the principle is based than in the principle itself. But with all that I am persuaded to believe that it does not and ought not to be allowed to affect the application of the principle in practice. Let us take "non-violence" and "non-co-operation" separately.

(1) *Non-violence*:—Mahatmaji's 'non-violence' is conceived on a very much higher plane than what I agreed to adopt owing to the compelling necessity of the case. The doctrine of *ahimsa* with all its implications and logical deductions has not been and cannot be adopted by the Congress which professes to include men of all religions and creeds in the world within its fold. Islam does not recognise it as an invariable and inflexible rule of life and there are many Hindu castes and sects with which the judicious use of violence is an accepted article of faith. Whilst Mahatmaji would not resort to violence under any circumstances whatever in thought, word or deed, many true Congressmen would, under certain conditions, consider it their highest duty to resort to actual physical violence. In fact, I hold that it would be doing violence to the highest and noblest feelings implanted in man if we ruled out violence in any shape or form under all conceivable circumstances. If I see a bully ill-treating or assaulting a person weaker than himself, I would not merely interpose my body between the assailant and the victim and thus enable him to have two victims instead of one, but try to knock him down and thus save both his victim and myself. Again if I were assaulted, I would defend myself, if necessary, by inflicting violence on my assailant and that violence may under certain circumstances extend even to the causing of the assailant's death. I need not give other illustrations of a similar nature which can easily be con-

<sup>1</sup>Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, Vol. 23 (Ahmedabad, 1967), Appendix XIV.

ceived. As for non-violence in thought, it is obvious that one who is prepared to resort to actual violence on certain occasions cannot be entirely free from the thought of it. By joining the movement of non-violent non-co-operation all I have undertaken to do is, to refrain from inflicting or even contemplating violence of any kind in carrying out the programme of non-co-operation against the Government. This is what I take Mahatmaji to mean, when he speaks of "non-violence in its full sense, but restricted as to the cause for which it was taken." If a Government official chooses to behave to me like the bully of my illustration in matters wholly unconnected with the Congress programme, he shall receive exactly the same treatment as I would give to the bully. The doctrine of non-violence has, so far as I am concerned, a limited application for the very special purpose for which I have adopted it.

Mahatmaji says entry into the Councils is "tantamount to participation in violence". I understand this to refer to the fact that the Councils are established by a Government which is based on violence. I maintain that no one living under such a Government can help participating in that sense. The very act of living and adopting the most essential means of sustaining life under such a Government would be "tantamount to participation in violence". Whether or not going into the Councils is a more direct participation in violence than merely living under a Government based on violence is only a question of degree and depends on the object with which one goes into the Councils.

Mahatmaji has been pleased to doubt the accuracy of the statement that "nobody takes the extreme view of non-violence that I do, and that most Congressmen confine the definition of non-violence to mere abstention from causing physical hurt to the opponent." There may be some who take the extreme view in theory, but I do not know a single follower of Mahatmaji who acts upon it. It is true that non-violence even in the limited sense that I give to it must relate both to word and deed and cannot be confined to abstention from causing physical hurt only. But non-violence in thought must be ruled out entirely as impracticable. Otherwise, we shall be weaving a cobweb of casuistry around us from which it would be impossible to extricate ourselves.

(2) *Non-co-operation*:—I confess my inability to see any trace of non-co-operation in the present day activities of the Congress. They may possibly lead to non-co-operation at some future date, but can by no stretch of imagination be taken to constitute non-co-operation. We have only the Bardoli programme before us, but there is nothing in it which can in any sense amount to actual non-co-operation with the Government. Mahatmaji says that the triple boycott has not failed because the lawyers have lost their prestige, the parents have lost faith in Government school education, and the Councils have lost their glamour. I admit all that and more for, in my opinion, the number of things lost can easily be multiplied. But the question is whether this has been due to the practice of the boycott or is the result of Mahatmaji's teachings. And does it not show a far sadder state of things than that which existed before these boycotts were conceived? The number of lawyers and of the school-going population has considerably increased and that of the Councillors remains the same. The only difference is that, while before 1920 people took to the profession of law, sent their children to Government schools and entered the Councils honestly believing that they were doing the right thing,

they did the same in 1921-23 with the knowledge and belief that they were doing a great wrong not only to themselves but to the whole nation. Has this improved the standard of public morality? The triple boycott has in my humble judgment only shown that the preaching of high ideals which the people are not ready to follow can only result in positive harm. The honest thing to do is to admit failure and frankly give up the triple boycott. The Swarajists would have done it had it not been for their belief that they had no chance of success with the masses against Mahatmaji's teachings. The next best thing they could do was to introduce a real element of non-co-operation in the Councils. In this there can be no question that they have eminently succeeded.

I shall now take the liberty to examine the case made out by Mahatmaji against Council-entry. He makes a grave and serious charge against Swarajists by saying that "the entry into the Legislative bodies has retarded the progress towards swaraj". I respectfully but emphatically join issue and maintain that exactly the contrary has been the case. What has actually happened is that the Assembly has laid a foundation for the people's swaraj broad-based on their free will and choice. Whether the demand made by the Assembly will be conceded or not is immaterial. Whether any actual progress towards swaraj through the Councils is possible or not is equally beside the point. But how any action taken in the Assembly or the Provincial Councils has actually "retarded the progress towards swaraj" simply beats my comprehension. I should have thought that the Swarajists have at least shown to a doubting world that they are a determined set of men who will have nothing short of swaraj. The positive value of this demonstration may perhaps be doubted but it is hardly fair to attribute a negative value to it.

I will now deal with the reasons given by Mahatmaji categorically.

(a) Council-entry is "tantamount to taking part directly or indirectly in the present system of Government." There are innumerable things we do every day of our lives by which we take part directly or indirectly in the present system of Government. The objection, however, seems to be based on the assumption that the Legislative bodies are "a chief part of the machinery designed to sustain that system". It would be more accurate to say that the Legislative bodies are merely an ornamental part of the machinery designed to justify the existing system. The truth is that the Government is absolutely independent of the Legislative bodies, which do not really sustain the system but are designed to conceal the fraud which the Government is practising on the world. The Swarajists have entered the Councils to expose this fraud not by taking part in it, but by refusing to take such part. I am at a loss to reconcile this dictum of Mahatmaji with his acquiescence in Congressmen taking part in the Municipal Councils. A cursory perusal of the various Municipal Acts in force in this country will show that these bodies are a most essential part of the administration and can only be carried on by complete co-operation with the Government in all important matters. They nullify the boycott of schools, for almost every Municipality applies for and obtains handsome grants from the public revenues to run the schools. They bring about the anomaly of Congressmen having to carry out the policy of Ministers appointed under the Government of India Act and submitting the former to the control of the latter. There

are many other things which do not merely smell of co-operation but amount to direct participation in the system of Government.

(b) *Obstruction.* This is a very much misused and misapplied word, but I admit that our Swarajist nostrils are not trained enough to smell violence in it, and fail to see how the Swarajist programme can possibly have a stronger smell of violence than the breaking of the Criminal Law Amendment Act and the various forms of picketing and *hartals* authorised by the Congress. I take Civil Disobedience itself to be the highest form of obstruction. But let us not lay undue stress on words and consider what the Swarajists have actually done. They have carried out the programme to the full in the C.P. Let us see what has been done there. The first step taken was to pass a vote of 'No Confidence' in the Ministers. That really meant no confidence in the system which brought Ministers into existence and that was made perfectly clear in the speeches made in support of the motion. The Government did not dismiss the Ministers as it should have done after this vote. The next step taken was to refuse the salaries of the Ministers, but they continued to stick to their offices and introduce measures relating to their departments. These measures were all rejected, because the Council refused to recognise the Ministers after the vote of "No Confidence" and the refusal of their salaries. Then came the budget on which the Council had no effective control. It was thrown out on the express ground that the Council would be no party to the expenditure of public revenues in the raising of which it had no voice and in the spending of which it had no control. Some other Bills were thrown out on similar grounds. This is all that has happened. I invite an examination of each of these acts of the Swarajists on its own merits and ask if any objection can be taken to any one of them on the highest moral and ethical grounds. The same acts can be and have been described as acts of obstruction, acts of destruction, and acts of wrecking from various points of view. But nothing turns upon mere phrases. What you have to look to is the substance and I claim that what was done in the C.P. in substance was non-co-operation with a Government which paid no heed to the popular will. The same applies to the acts of the Swarajists in the Assembly and the Bengal Council.

(c) *Constructive Programme.* I could not understand what this objection meant, but Mahatmaji has since explained to me that all that it meant was that the time and energy given to the question of Council-entry was so much time and energy taken away from the constructive programme. So far as that goes it applies only to the No-changers, for the Swarajists were practically expelled from the Congress Executive and had no control on the organisations of the various departments of the constructive programme. The only alternatives to Council-entry open to them were, either to go into retirement or start independent organisations to carry on the constructive programme, neither of which would have helped the cause.

(d) *Entry is premature.* I am afraid I do not quite grasp this objection. If it means that we should have waited till we got swaraj it begs the whole question. As for a "constant, almost irresistible temptation to depart from truthfulness and non-violence in the atmosphere of the Councils", all I can say is that I have perceived no difference in the Council atmosphere from that outside the Councils. The "strain" on discipline will certainly not be more prolonged in the

Councils than it is sure to be in the long expectation of Civil Disobedience.

(e) *Khilafat and Punjab Causes*. Apart from the fact that these causes are practically dead, I do not see what special connection there is between them and the question of entry into the Councils.

The above are the principal reasons given by Mahatmaji against the entry of Congressmen into the Councils. A few other points are mentioned in passing in the course of the general remarks that follow the main reasons. After acknowledging the "brilliant victories of the Swarajists" Mahatmaji proceeds to point out that all that the Swarajists have done could be achieved "before non-co-operation", that we could, "not merely get a Gandhi released, but many Hasrat Mohanis and all Punjab prisoners" by "fairly directed agitation" and that there is not "much in the *khaddar* demonstration, or in keeping so many Moderates out". "The machinery of the Government goes on unchecked with or without the Moderates and in spite of obstruction." In adopting this line of argument, Mahatmaji has done less than justice to himself. The Swarajists have never taken any credit for the release of Mahatmaji or the demonstration of *khaddar*, but they have certainly succeeded in keeping the Moderates out which the boycott of Councils under Mahatmaji's programme could not achieve. I agree that the real machinery of the Government goes on unchecked, but we claim that we have taken out the false and ornamental parts of the machinery and exposed its true character to the world. If it was right to send thirty thousand of our workers to gaol simply to establish the fact that the visit of the Prince of Wales was forced upon a discontented people, it was certainly worth something to expose the continuing fraud practised day to day in the name of the representatives of the people.

The unkindest cut of all is contained in the sentence: "It was not to be expected that the Swarajists could be convinced by any argument." All I can say is that the Swarajists in all humility claim to exercise their own judgment and have not yet heard anything that could carry conviction to them.

After this Mahatmaji makes one or two more observations, which must be noticed. He says, "I would enter the Councils only if I could believe that I could make use of them for the advancement of the country. I must therefore have faith in the machinery and those in charge of it. I cannot be part of the machinery and still want to destroy it." I venture to submit that this argument suffers from the weakness of all arguments based on analogies and metaphors. I do not see why one must have faith in those whom one finds in charge of machinery, if it can be worked better by others. I should have thought that the most perfect machinery could be so hopelessly mismanaged by those in charge as to require their immediate removal. There can be no harm in taking over a rickety old machine from the hands of mechanics bent on evil, and try to run it after proper repairs for the benefit of those in whose interest it ought to be worked. We have not become parts of the machinery in order to destroy it. There are certain imported parts of the machine which destroy the goods in the process of manufacture. We are for the present taking out those parts and substituting ourselves for them, hoping eventually to have an entirely new machine of pure swadeshi make to be run by the people for the people.

Council-entry as a settled fact, answers the question: "What is to be done now?" As was to be expected, he has given the only answer which the resolutions of the Delhi and Coacanada Congress could admit of. But I venture to think that something more than a mere interpretation of those resolutions is necessary. The most important point to be considered is what is to be the position of the Swarajists in the general Congress movement. Is it to be somewhat similar to that assigned by Mahatmaji to practising lawyers who were compared to cobblers and declared debarred from taking an active part in the Councils of the Congress and from being appointed on its Executive? If that is the idea, Swarajists must deprive themselves of the honour of remaining under the distinguished leadership of Mahatmaji and, either retire from public life or look for "fresh fields and pastures new". But if that is not the idea, I believe it is yet possible to work together for the common cause. Certain proposals have occurred to me in this connection and I put them in the order in which they appeal to me.

1. A new programme of work in the Councils may be framed by the Congress with the object of helping the outside activities of the Congress in the direction of "construction" and "Non-co-operation." The programme so framed will then stand in place of a mandate from the country which every Swarajist would be bound to carry out and all Congressmen bound to support. In this case, all distinctions between Swarajists and Non-Swarajists or Pro-changers and No-changers will disappear, but while all will act together, generally such Congressmen will only go into the Councils as have no objection to do so. Funds required for Council propaganda will be granted by the vote of the Working Committee subject to the control of the All-India Committee exactly in the same manner as for other Congress purposes, and with due regard to the relative importance of the various heads of Congress expenditure. It will be permissible to donors to the Tilak Swaraj Fund to earmark their contribution for Councils if they choose.

2. A separate section or department of the Congress called the Councils Section or department may be opened and placed in sole charge and direction of the Swarajists. The latter will take part in the general activities of the Congress outside the Councils and help those activities in the Councils as desired by the Congress. In this case also, there will be some Swarajists on the General Executive, but no financial help will be given from the Tilak Swaraj Fund *not* earmarked for the Councils. The difference between the first proposal and this is that, while in the former case the Congress will lay down the whole programme for the Councils, in the latter case it will only call upon the Swarajists to take particular steps such as those referred to by Mahatmaji at the end of his draft, viz. the propagation of *khaddar* and the abolition of drink revenue.

3. To carry on as now under the Delhi and Coacanada resolutions without any disqualification attaching to Swarajists as such. In this case Swarajists will frame and carry out their own policy without reference to the Congress and will collect their own funds and the Congress will not in any way interfere with them. The Swarajya Party will do all it can to carry out the constructive programme of the Congress and the Congress will help and support that action.

214. *Speech at AICC meeting, Ahmedabad on Gandhi's Resolution, 28 June 1924*<sup>1</sup>

Can they put their hands in their hearts and tell us honestly if they believed in the *Charkha* programme? During Mahatmaji's absence where was that belief gone? Mr. Gandhi spoke of discipline. He also wanted discipline, but in the name of discipline they could not commit breaches of the Constitution and what was more, do things opposed in the letter and the spirit to all accepted notions of democracy. We have tried for peace in every possible way consistent with the self-respect of the Swaraj Party, but our attempt has not succeeded for the present. We have not lost faith and we are still looking forward to a united Congress in the near future.

### BELIEF IN CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAMME

In the meantime we have to make our position clear. We believe in the Constructive Programme, but we do not believe that by itself and without any other activity it will or can lead to Swaraj within a reasonable period of time. It is because we believe in the Constructive Programme we have always been and are still willing to help Mahatmaji in every possible way. If he has no faith in us we are willing to let him have complete control in carrying out that work and we undertake to see that no obstruction or hindrance is caused by the Swarajists in the faithful carrying out of any directions or instructions that he may issue from time to time in regard to the constructive programme. We were and still are prepared to allow any agents whom he may appoint in this behalf every facility in the Provinces where Swarajists have anything to do with the executive and we were and still are prepared to undertake not to interfere with that work in any way whatsoever. But we are not prepared to surrender our rights. The Indian National Congress belongs as much to us as to the opposite party. We will not allow, if we can help it, the Constitution to be changed according to the caprice of a narrow majority whenever it may think necessary to crush the minority. The demand that the Swarajists should go out of the executive is, under the circumstances, an unreasonable demand and it is only due to our self-respect that we must resist it. We declare that the resolution under discussion is an unconstitutional contrivance and we go away to-day only to return with a majority whose duty it will be to refuse its sanction to such unconstitutional attempts.

215. *Speech at Unveiling Ceremony of Lokamanya Tilak's Statue, 27 July 1924*<sup>2</sup>

I thank you for the great honour you have done me by inviting me to preside over this historic function and perform one of the most sacred duties that can fall to the lot of any Indian living to-day. It is indeed a high honour to be

<sup>1</sup>*The Bombay Chronicle*, 30 June 1924.

<sup>2</sup>*The Bombay Chronicle*, 25 July 1924.

chosen to lead the worship of a nation's idol enshrined in the living hearts of millions of his countrymen. Bal Gangadhar Tilak had in his life-time built for himself a golden niche in the temple of fame and needed no bronze or marble to mark his greatness. The need for it is all ours whose solemn duty it is to render our homage of love and reverence to the departed leader and hand down to succeeding generations a lasting emblem of our devotion to him. Mr. Kelkar, you have referred to the lawsuit brought by the Government against the Municipal Councillors to recover the part of the price already paid for this statue and also for an injunction restraining you from spending any more Municipal money over it. The matter is sub judice and it is not open to me to discuss the merits, but whatever the strict rights of the parties to the suit may be, I have not the slightest doubt that the real party that matters, namely the Municipal rate-payer, if consulted, will give his hearty approval to your patriotic action whatever the Government may do or the Court may decide. You will have the supreme satisfaction of having discharged your duty both by the people and by him whose memory they adore. There is another aspect of this question; in presenting to the nation a life-like image of their Greatest Citizen, the members of the Poona City Municipality have shown how well they have learnt the lessons of his great life.

### HERO-WORSHIP

Himself a hero of heroes, we know what a devoted hero-worshipper he was. Speaking of Shivaji he said:—"Hero-worship as a feeling deeply implanted in human nature and our political aspirations need all the strength which the worship of a Swadeshi hero is likely to inspire in our minds. For this purpose Shivaji is the only hero to be found in Indian history. He was born at a time when the whole nation required relief from misrule and by his self-sacrifice and courage, proved to the world that India was not a country forsaken by Providence." Little did he suspect, when he uttered those words in appreciation of a great hero of the dead past, that he had, in his own person, given to the nation no less a hero in the living present; little did he realize that in those simple words he was giving the most faithful picture of himself. For, was not Bal Gangadhar Tilak "born at a time when the whole nation required relief from misrule"? And was it not Bal Gangadhar Tilak who, "by his self-sacrifice and courage, proved to the world that India was not a country forsaken by Providence"? I know I am giving a handle for adverse criticism by this comparison, but I stand by it. I maintain that the turbulent misrule of the latter half of the 17th century with all the fighting for life and property that it involved, was far less harmful to our national existence than the peaceful and benevolent rule of the 19th and 20th centuries which has made us utter strangers in our guarded homes.

### SOURCE OF INSPIRATION

The truth is, that to-day our political aspirations need all the strength which the worship of Tilak can inspire in us; and I congratulate you, Mr. Kelkar and your patriotic colleagues, for providing the nation with a tangible source of



the inspiration it needs. I can scarcely imagine any Indian worth his salt who will have *darshan* of this faithful image of the Lokmanya without feeling instantly lifted up above his immediate surroundings to a higher plane and a higher sense of duty to his country. You have spoken highly of the art of the sculptor, Mr Wagh.<sup>1</sup> I am sure, we shall soon see for ourselves that he deserves all the praise you have given him and more. But what appeals to me most strongly is that the successful execution of this memorable piece of work by Mr. Wagh has added a pleasing factor to this function. We are here to worship a Swadeshi hero through the art of a Swadeshi sculptor: a happy circumstance which adds a special charm to the ceremony.

### LESSONS FROM LOKMANYA'S LIFE

Many and various are the glowing tributes paid to the great work of our hero by the ablest writers and speakers of the day. My contribution can be but poor. But I crave your indulgence to put before you a few thoughts on the lesson of his great life as I read it. I shall not detain you at any length over his early career or even the later achievements of his versatile genius which distinguished him as a great scholar, a vigorous writer, and a clear thinker. The *Orion*, the *Arctic Home* and the *Gita Rahasya*, monuments of scholarship and original thinking as they are, have been aptly described by Babu Aurobindo Ghose as merely the by-products of the great genius of Tilak. For as he observes that these works were produced "in periods of compulsory cessation from his life-work,—planned and partly, if not wholly, executed during the imprisonments which could alone enforce leisure upon this unresting worker for his country."

### CALL OF POLITICS

But we have in this very circumstance a unique lesson to learn. The pages of Indian History are adorned by numerous examples of self-sacrifice. We have inspiring instances of the sacrifice of wealth, power, comfort, position and life itself but where is so elevating a parallel as Tilak's sacrifice of intellectual gifts of the highest order in the service of his country. He deliberately closed down the welling-springs of higher knowledge and threw himself among the masses to work and toil unto them. It was no ordinary sacrifice for the author of the *Arctic Home* and the *Gita Rahasya* to force his great genius to stoop to

<sup>1</sup>Vinayak Venkatrao Wagh, b 1883 in Karwar district, Kamataka, educated at Belgaum and Bombay, obtained Diploma in Art (Sculpture and Modelling) from Sir J.J. School of Art, Bombay, sculptor to Viceroy Lord Hardinge, 1914, Lord Willingdon, Governor of Bombay, 1915, George Lloyd, Governor of Bombay, 1920, Leslie Wilson, Governor of Bombay, 1925, established Wagh's Fine Arts Studio in Bombay, which was appointed sculptors to Rajendra Prasad, President of India, 1951, Sri Prakasa, Governor of Bombay, 1961, commissioned to prepare busts and statues of eminent personalities in various fields; awarded Silver Medal for Sculpture at the Bombay Art Society Exhibition, 1926, Life member, Bombay Art Society and Art Society of India; d 1958.

the common-place occupation of editing a newspaper bearing in mind that these great works were written under the hardships, restrictions and limitations of a prison. Imagination staggers when one tries to think what the author would have given to the world, if he had allowed full and free play to his gigantic intellect in the peace and quiet of a home or of a cloister. The choice before Tilak lay between a place of honour in the galaxy of the greatest *Rishis* and *Munis* that this ancient land has produced, and a prisoner's cell which was the sure lot of a public man of his activities. He chose the latter and curbed his genius which left to itself would have revealed in the high realms of religion, philosophy, science, and literature, to adapt itself to the pace of the man in the street and the man behind the plough. For a considerable time, he gave his best to the *Kesari* which, by its ever growing popularity, carried his political philosophy to every home in Maharashtra and is to-day the undaunted exponent and champion of his political thought. He inaugurated the Ganapati and the Shivaji Festivals which awaken the spirit of the glorious past and called on every true son of Maharashtra to strive to regain her lost glory.

### IRONY OF FATE

But what happened. Observe the *crucial irony of the times we live in!* Two years before the death of its founder the Shivaji Festival was pronounced to be a seditious and revolutionary movement by a committee whose name is a bye-word unfit to be uttered on this solemn occasion. Two years after the death of Tilak came H.R.H. the Prince of Wales and laid the foundation stone of the Shivaji Memorial. He spoke of Shivaji as the founder of Mahratta greatness, whose spirit was still burning bright and clear and commended the association of his name with educational institutions so as to make the Mahratta people no less renowned in arts of peace than in those of war. Thus it was that the idea underlying the movement pronounced to be seditious and revolutionary in 1918 found royal sanction in 1922 and thus it will be that in the near future we shall march into the promised land with Tilak's war-cry 'Swarajya is my birth-right' resounding throughout the country. It usually takes volumes to describe the life-work of a great man.

### GALVANISING THE CONGRESS

But if I were asked what is Tilak's life-work, my short answer would be, "You see it all around you." There is hardly a single political activity of any consequence today which does not either owe its inception to Tilak or derive sustenance from his vigorous preaching. I mean no disrespect to those pioneers of political reform who inaugurated the Indian National Congress and carried it on through good and evil report, with ability, perseverance and courage, which will always be associated with their undying memories; but what was the Congress before Tilak put his spirit into it. It was nothing more than an academical society of the talent of the country meeting once a year to consider the best means of importing the ideas and methods of free European countries into this land of bondage. Tilak was the first to take the message of political emancipation to the very door of the masses. It was he, who boldly proclaimed

not turn your hand to better use for your action than drudging on in this fashion. Let your places be filled by Europeans on the splendid salary of eight annas a day if possible".

In these passages, we have the ground fully prepared for Mahatma Gandhi long before he left S. Africa for good and took prominent part in the politics of the mother country. It was reserved for Mahatmaji's incomparable genius to awaken sufficient political consciousness in the people to grasp these ideas in 1920 and so to translate them into action in 1921-22 as to puzzle and perplex the bureaucracy from top to bottom. What happened after 1922, is a subject of controversy and need not be discussed on this occasion.

### POLITICAL TACTICS AND RELIGION

Tilak fought for Swarajya, full and complete, at the earliest possible moment, but his guiding principle was: "Take what you can get and fight for the rest." Politics was an all-absorbing passion with him and he brought all the strength of his vigorous mind to concentrate upon purely political methods to gain political ends. Deeply religious by nature, he eschewed religion in politics, holding that the doctrine of 'avoid and suffer' had no place there. Coming from a strong and sturdy race of fighters, he believed in fighting a clean fight to the finish. The lesson he taught was: "Capture every seat of power, influence and prestige, and fight from that seat to obtain more power, more influence and more prestige." Religion and asceticism had their own proper place in his conception of life but were on no account to be mixed up with politics. He had seen the mighty Maratha Empire crumble to pieces by the injudicious admixture of a pseudo-asceticism with the purely secular methods of attack and defence in political warfare. Himself a cultured Brahmin not without a taste of ascetic practices, he realized that to a fighter in his country's cause, a virtuous life, with all the faculties bestowed by God fully developed, was the first essential. Not that he did not believe in the influence of religious fervour and spirituality on the political life of our country. He had as clear a perception of this, as any other political thinker of his day and left no doubt on that score by founding the Ganapati Festival and above all by his own life, pure as crystal. But it is a far cry from believing in one's religion to using one's religious practices for political ends and it is a farther cry from religion to superstition. The goddess of politics the *Ishidevi* of Tilak claimed him all for herself and would brook no interference from religion or superstition, and Tilak, passionately devoted to his *Ishidevi* gave her all that there was in him. My friend Mr. M.R. Jayakar, who knew Tilak well and intimately, if only behind the scenes, has related to me a beautiful anecdote bearing on the selflessness of Tilak's life and his settled conviction that religion has no place in politics. Let me share the pleasure of it with you. It will bear repetition even if you have heard it before. Some one asked Tilak what he would do after Swarajya was attained. He said:—"I would teach Mathematics for the rest of my life" and added "as long as the country is enslaved, scholarship and asceticism are luxuries which I cannot afford." You see here the scholar and the ascetic cast into the all-consuming flame of love of the motherland. He

believed that it was possible even in the sordidness of politics and the materiality of political ambition to surround one's self with the equanimity and the detachment of an ascetic, but he stoutly refused to give a religious or philosophical lining to his politics. It was this belief that gave him marvellous composure, his strong nerve, his intense vigour, and his great dignity. As I utter these words, I recall to my mind the one solitary figure standing unmoved on the dais at the abortive session of the Surat Congress with his arms crossed on his chest, the very picture of an iron determination to enforce his right of speech on an unwilling house plunged in chaos and confusion. It is said that by too stringent an exclusion of religion from politics, he encouraged an *ethical casuistry*, which led to the open preaching of the doctrine that the end justifies the means. But great men have their own way. Small men may criticise. They can take nothing from their greatness.

### SOCIAL REFORMS

This same all-absorbing passion for politics accounts, also for the strict exclusion of social reform from Tilak's programme. Would the remarriage of all the widows in India or the wholesale breaking of caste by all and sundry, bring us any nearer to Swaraj? These are mostly questions for the socio-political reformer. There are enough widows in India who are premitted to remarry and a great number who have actually remarried. There are enough men and women in India who have either no caste or having one, break it at every turn. Are the remarried widows or the men and women of no caste any better off under the present foreign rule than the poor child doomed to perpetual widowhood or the man who wastes half his precious time in preserving caste. Tilak never denied that social reform was as essential as political reform. The simple lesson of his life is that you cannot achieve the one by striving for the other or by mixing up the two. As politics was the sole occupation of his life everything else gave way to it; but in his own life, he was a much more practical social reformer than most persons who are keen on holding social conferences. He had no trammels of orthodox habits and knew when and how to yield to the claims and exigencies of modern life. He challenged the social reformers of his day to join him in inviting social legislation to bind themselves, but not the masses, who were not ready for a sudden break from their long-cherished past. Such a challenge was evaded by Mr. Justice Ranade of revered memory and has not been taken up since.

### BORN IN POLITICS, LIVED IN POLITICS, DIED IN POLITICS

Tilak believed in the mission of his race as it was and had confidence in its powers of action in the service of the motherland. He was born in politics, he lived in politics, and he died in politics. I have now given you the principal features of his life which have impressed me most. It is not possible, on an occasion like this, to deal with the many-sided activities of a life of incessant action. I don't pretend to have succeeded even in doing bare justice to the most remarkable traits of the character of this most remarkable man. I have but paid my homage of love and respect as a humble soldier of the national army

to the memory of one of its greatest departed generals. I shall now proceed to remove the screen which stands between the *darshan* of the Lokmanya and the thousands of expectant worshippers I see around me.

*216. Programme of the Swaraj Party, 1 August 1924<sup>1</sup>*

Agenda of the General Meeting of the Swarajya Party to be held in Calcutta at 65, Bagh Bazar Street on the 16th August 1924 at 3 p.m.

(1) To revise the policy, constitution and programme of the party.

(2) To elect the office-bearers and members of the General Council.

(3) To transact such other business as may be brought forward with the permission of the chair.

The General Council elected at the General Meeting of the party will meet at a time and place to be announced immediately after the party meeting to transact the following business:—

(1) Election of Committees and disposal of such matters as may be referred to the General Council by the party meeting by a special resolution under the constitution and rules as revised.

(2) To consider the rules recommended for confirmation by the members of the Swarajya Party in the Legislative Assembly and the Provincial Legislative Councils.

There is a general desire to reconstitute the General Council so as to include in it all the Swarajist members of the Assembly and the Provincial Legislatures besides a proportion to be elected by each province. In anticipation of this desire being given effect to it is particularly requested that all Swarajist members of the Assembly and the Provincial Legislatures will make a point of attending the party meeting on the 16th August. Provinces which have not yet elected the allotted number of members to the General Council under the existing rules are requested to do so as early as possible, and communicate the names of the members elected to the General Secretary at Allahabad.

A sufficient number of copies of the rules made by members of Provincial Councils which require confirmation by the General Council should be supplied to the General Secretary in good time before the party meeting.

Members who require accommodation in Calcutta will kindly communicate with Babu Satyendra Chandra Mitra, General Secretary, Bengal Provincial Swarajya Committee, 9, Russa Road, North Calcutta.

Motilal Nehru  
General Secretary  
Swarajya Party

<sup>1</sup>Forward, 8 August 1924.

217. *Speech in Calcutta, 16 August 1924<sup>1</sup>*

It is a practice for the General Secretary to submit a report at this gathering and give a sort of review of the past activities of the year. This is the second year of our Party. I was considering this morning whether I was to write out a report and have it duly printed as is the practice in the Congress and other institutions of this kind. But when I looked into myself and wanted to know what the materials were I felt there was scarcely any member of the party in this hall or any one outside who takes an intelligent interest in public matters, who is not aware that the whole history of our party for a considerable period was a history of prolonged struggle for barest existence. You all know that the party was started at Gaya in January 1923 and then it met at Allahabad in February 1923, when the programme and constitution from which the President has just quoted to you was laid down. From that moment began the trouble, from that moment our friends of the Congress, the other wing of the Congress opposed us at every step and it was not till September 1923 when the Special Congress met in Delhi that a compromise was arrived at and all counter-propaganda was by common consent suspended. It was only then that our hands were free and we began work.

## ELECTION MANIFESTO HOLDS GOOD

The general elections were to commence in November and it was not until the middle of October that the party was able to issue its electoral manifesto, that manifesto which had the honour of being quoted in the House of Lords and criticised there. That election manifesto holds good to-day as the President has shown you in his vigorous speech that we have redeemed in substance everything that we said, all promises we made and all pledges that we gave. Now as every electorate was informed and as we said in that manifesto that everything lay in the hands of our countrymen. I have often said in public meetings and in election meetings that our success depends on the numbers in which you send us. If you do not give us the arms to fight with, you cannot expect us to win in the battle. What are our arms and ammunitions except our numbers in these Councils and legislative bodies? Return us in a majority and you will find that we will redeem every pledge we gave. But if you do not return us in a majority what can we do? People of the C.P. proved their metal. They did return the Swarajist members to the Legislative Council in a majority and they formed a clear majority there and what did the members of the Central Provinces do? They at once resorted to uniform, continuous and consistent obstruction—words which have been so much criticised of late and criticised now. These words are applied not to Nagpur, not to the Central Provinces, not to any Council where the majority consists of Swarajists but usually to Madras and to the Assembly and other provinces where we are in a distinct minority. You will remember in that election manifesto what we promised was that we shall resort to this policy of uniform,

<sup>1</sup>Forward, 17 August 1924. Speech at the All India Swaraj Party Conference held in Calcutta.

continuous and consistent obstruction if we are in a majority; and if we are in a minority we shall defeat the Government as often as we can with or without the support of our nationalist friends. I ask you to look into the proceedings of the various Legislative Councils and Assembly and say that whether we have failed on one single occasion to inflict a defeat on the Government when it was possible to inflict one. So far as the Assembly is concerned, I can speak from my personal knowledge as I have had the honour of acting there as the leader of your party in the Assembly. There was no single case in which the Government chose to come into conflict with the party when it was not heavily defeated and yet we are in minority, we are only 45 in a House of 144. How did we manage it? The Anglo-Indian papers gave me the distinction of a black-magician, a person who knew some charm to induce the nationalist and other innocent members of the Assembly simply to follow them into lobbies without understanding what it meant. I had the good fortune to have in the nationalist party gentlemen who had really the interest of the nation at heart and although they were not prepared to subscribe to the full extent to the policy of the Swarajists, they strove as hard and as earnestly as any Swarajist to attain the goal, namely, Swaraj and by means which the President has just described to you. The President has said enough about methods of the party.

### ABSURDITY OF FIXED RULES

There is a school which expects everything to be done by rules of thumb by some sort of tabled and fixed rules always to be applied without any distinction. Now, for instance, there is well-known and much used phrase—widely circulated among the Swarajist members in the Assembly and that is 'Never go into the Government lobby.' It was so frequently used and by so many persons that even I who is responsible for every word that occurred in the rules—even I was led to believe that that must be the guiding principle of the party. But then I thought what it could possibly mean? There is not such a lobby as the Government lobby. There are only two lobbies in the Assembly as well as in the provinces and they are 'Ayes and Noes'. Whichever lobby Government goes in becomes the Government lobby. If we are not to go into the Government lobby it means that we must not go to a lobby in which the Government members go. Just consider for a moment to what ridiculous extent it goes. Suppose we are about to carry on a proposition and the Government think that they are losing, and they just send four or five people to the lobby, is it that the lobby is just converted into the Government lobby?

### ABSURDITIES OF RULES

Then there are points of order raised. Our rules which are meant to bind us together and to create cohesion between us so that we may march shoulder to shoulder are used not for the purpose of consolidating our power but for the purpose of disruption. Points of orders and phrases have been raised. I had the temerity to ask some of my friends whether they have known any case in the history where freedom was won on points of order. When you are in

the fight, marching against the enemy what are you to do? You must simply go on, you have got to go on and sometimes stand still also; but you cannot say that because you are marching you must not rest for a while. These are absurdities to which our critics lend their support only in order to accuse us.

(The President: Deductive logic.)

We have so far tried to discharge our duties to the best of our ability. I must mention one more fact about the Assembly. There was the Tariff Bill, Steel Protection Bill, as you are aware, which was supported by the Swarajists. Now that bill happened to be introduced by the Government and the question was whether the bill being introduced by the Government the Swarajists will support it. However much they like the steel industry of India to be developed, however much they like to produce it in this country and to protect it from foreign competition, but simply because it was a bill introduced by the Government many of my friends fought shy of it. They said, 'It is co-operation!'

## HOW CO-OPERATION BEGAN

Now I tell you how co-operation began. When the Assembly met and this Bill began to be considered reporters in the galleries had their eyes fixed on me and certain friends of mine. The first thing they noticed was that I smiled at some one on the Government benches and they faithfully reported that incident and they said that 'co-operation has begun.' Well gentlemen, I had to confess that it was my besetting sin to smile. I have a smile both at my friends and foes alike. (Mr. Das: Because you cannot look like an owl.)

The President has said that I do not look like an owl. The next thing was that I moved an amendment which was the resultant of all the amendments upon that particular point and it concerned with the question of Indian capital and control and so on. These amendments were there on the agenda. Some of them had been put and pressed before the Assembly. They were all opposed by the Government. (A voice: Many of them were disallowed.)

I took up the more important of them, strung them together in one resolution and proposed it with the permission of my friends and the President. Now the Government took time to consider it and in doing so they asked the House to adjourn for a day. As the House was adjourned some members of the Government crossed over to my side of the chamber. They wanted to talk to me about my amendment and to fix up some time to talk with me on behalf of my party after they had consulted His Excellency the Viceroy. The press faithfully reported that step number two in co-operation was taken and Panditji, the leader of the Swaraj Party, was actually in deep consultation with the members of the Government! Then, when the Government was obliged to admit four out of the five points of my amendments, the newspapers reported that 'Here is the co-operation resolution of Pandit Nehru adopted by the Government!' It was really the Government resolution which I moved and which the Government supported and thus there was complete co-operation



and they cited that long phrase of uniform, continuous and consistent opposition! Now gentlemen, I put it to you, was it a case of my co-operating with the Government or was it a case of my compelling the Government to co-operate with me. If we are to put forward resolutions for Swaraj and if the Government went to meet us upon that resolution to consider the terms and to admit some of them, are we then also to be accused that in winning Swaraj we did not win it by non-co-operation but by co-operation with the Government?

I would ask you not to pay any heed to these absurdities and I ask you further not to judge members of the Assembly or any of the provincial legislative Councils by anything that they do or by any criticism to which they are subjected while they are in the fight. While the actual session of the Councils or Assembly is proceeding day after day, certain steps are being taken and it is not fair either to the members of the Assembly or members of the provincial Councils to judge them by each step, because you have to consider each step as a part of the whole battle, a part of the whole campaign and to look upon it as such. You cannot understand what each step, each word that is spoken in the Assembly or Councils must answer to this wooden rule of uniform continuous and consistent obstruction. As the President has put it, that is the creation of the atmosphere of resistance—atmosphere which is more frequently than not created by sweet words and not by bitter words. You find your enemy armed to the teeth, you find that by certain course of action you can compel them to lay down some of their arms, if not all. So please do not pronounce it as an act of co-operation if we are to make it so as to induce them to lay down some of their arms if not all. The army that is actually on the march is sometimes not only to stand still but often has to withdraw to make retreat only to fight all the stronger.

(A voice: You know the brilliant retreat of Cronje.)

Yes, you must not judge from that [that] the battle is lost. You have got to wait till the end of the battle before you pronounce your judgement. These are facts which I might have stated down in my report, but as it is well-known to you, it was not necessary to print and circulate it among you.

One thing more. It is customary to give in the report certain facts about the constitution and financial position of the party and as to anything which was done outside the Council. Now so far as the members of the party are concerned, as you all know, that since we started our party we have never up to this day cared to open a regular register in every province of the members of the Swarajist party. Indeed we fixed subscriptions of Rs. 3 annually which was considered by most of us as prohibitive and that was why we did not want to swell the number of the Swarajists outside the Congress. But we wanted to increase the number inside the Congress. We wanted them to become Congress members in large numbers and not to pay any subscriptions to us. The result of it was that we swelled the Congress membership, swelled the number of people holding Swarajists' views in the country, without having a regular register of them. We preferred to adopt the ancient method of sending out ideas, sending out members to the world, to our country, to be accepted by them and not to resort to the western idea of opening recruitment houses and register offices for enlisting Swarajist members. We were in the Congress, have no intention of

going out ever outside the Congress, nor shall we ever go out of it. Well, so I cannot give you a report on that point but you know how that idea has caught, what support we got at the polls. That gives you some idea of the membership of the party. You should remember that that was confined to a very few people who have been given franchise according to the rules framed by the Government. If the franchise was widespread, it would have lessened our trouble considerably, because all that we would have done in that case would have been to address a few mass meetings and to leave the rest to our countrymen. But now we find one or two votes among one or two thousands. The popularity that the party has obtained with the people of the land will be evident from the result of election and also from the response it has received elsewhere. Now with regard to the question of finance. The President has repelled the charge of bribery and corruption. I want the accusers to tell me where this money came from out of which Mr. Das paid it. I know as General Secretary of the party ought to know something about the fund and I have no hesitation in informing you that there never was anything in any balance on the right side of the account from the very beginning.

(A voice: Promises)

Promises of course. Promissory notes giving promises that was on the wrong side.

The election was contested absolutely without any fund. Where the enormous sums were spent by people, who contested the election against the Swarajists, what did the Swarajists pay? I do not know the figures of Bengal. But I was responsible for leading the election campaign in the U.P. We set up 55 candidates for the local Council, and there were 14 seats who were entitled to be elected for the Assembly and we set up 12. We captured all the seats, in the Assembly and 30 seats in the local Council. The cost of running these 67 candidates, including the deposit money paid, was 25,000 rupees and where did this money come from? The money came from either, by giving pro-notes, or it was paid by the people, who voted for us and not by any outsider. We had no time to collect fund.

(Mr. Das: In Bengal we spent Rs 30,000 to run the election and I borrowed all the sum myself.)

The president tells us that in Bengal he spent Rs. 30,000 to run the elections and he borrowed all the sum on his own promissory notes.

Gentlemen, they talk glibly of bribery and corruption. But why they do so? Because they cannot conceal from the world that they are the greatest bribe-givers that were ever born and you ever can conceive of. Why they do it openly? There are not only sub-deputyship, tahsildarship and sub-registrarship but there are the ministership, councillorship, holding open before everybody, as a reward for those who support them.

(Mr. B.K. Bose: What about H.E.'s speech at Dacca?)

I ask what code of ethics or morality prompted the Governor of Bengal to issue a solemn Government communique that the third Minister would be appointed out of the persons, who voted with the Government and for the Government.

(A voice: 'Will' vote with the Government.)

Yes, "will" vote. Is it any use answering such charges brought out by

shameless people who are bribing and committing corruption of all sorts in the public being the head of the province and charge us poor people who whatever we had at one time now do not know where to get it from.

Now there is another movement started and that is against me. That is not against Mr Das. I am supposed to have been making money in Bombay for the party on false promises. That is complimentary to the charges brought against Mr Das because they must make out where he got all this money from and must trace it to me because I was seen in Bombay realising subscriptions for the party. There was a particularly malicious tone about it in *The Times of India*. I replied to it and I suppose the note and my reply and that note will be reproduced in the *Forward* of tomorrow. The point is this that I openly went from place to place and had declared that I was in Bombay for the purpose of realising subscriptions for my party. I got some promises and came back from there because I was called away by some important business. When I went back I found that people whom I described in my answer to the *Times* as politicians in the unemployed list, I mean our moderate brethren, formed a clique, went round to the very places and told the people not to subscribe to our fund. The result was that I lost some subscriptions and others paid me some money. And after the money was safe in my pocket, the *Times* raised the storm, but I told them that I was going again to Bombay to realise some money there. If Das was paying bribes relying upon what I collect, he had been bribing people only on promises. That is the financial point, if you like. I do not know to how many people we owe money. We have been borrowing right and left, sometimes in villages and in towns, sometimes by giving pro-notes and sometimes they have trusted to our honour and we hope to repay them, sooner or later, if possible. They are not claiming it now, but they have trusted to our honour. So I cannot give you any complete accounts either on the debit or on the credit side. So this is all the information that I can give you in my report and I will not detain you any longer, because we are here really to have practical work. And that is to lay down our constitution according to the principle which has been just enunciated by the President. The whole country is waiting for that. Our organisation is waiting for that and as soon as we pass this, you will see some work done which will startle the whole world.

218. *Reply to an address by the Calcutta Corporation, 18 August 1924*<sup>1</sup>

Deshabandhu Das, Aldermen and Councillors of the Calcutta Corporation.  
Ladies and Gentlemen.

I thank you from the bottom of my heart for the honour you have done me to-night. I should have felt myself one of the proudest men in Calcutta to-day if I were vain to think that I really deserved so high a honour at your hands. Ladies and Gentlemen, I am not so weak. But if I say that I do not feel an elation on this occasion, I shall not be true to myself. What Indian heart is there which would not be thrilled by the scenes which I have witnessed

<sup>1</sup>*Forward*, 19 August 1924.

to-day. You, the Corporation of Calcutta, I can assure you that if I do not feel proud of myself, I do most certainly feel of the Calcutta Corporation, as it is constituted at present. You have to-day broken away from the recent past when addresses and receptions to persons of high authority were the order of the day. You have to-day established a principle, and an example,—which, I have no doubt, will be followed, in this and other Corporations and Municipal bodies,—of honouring in the persons of those who try to serve the motherland, the motherland herself. Whatever humble services it may have fallen to my lot to render to the country, they are not certainly such as would induce me to think that all this honour, all the ceremony, that you have organised, is due to anything remarkable, which I may have done in the course of my life. We know that this Corporation, we know that this Hall has so far been the scenes of series of demonstrations and ceremonies held in honour of persons in authority, and this honour has been indiscriminately done to them, simply because they have been men in authority without having regard to the services they might have rendered or might have failed to render.

### LAST CORPORATION'S WEAKNESS

In recent times your great city has been visited by great men like Mahatma Gandhi, the Late Lokamanya Tilak, Lala Lajpat Rai, but the predecessors in Office in this Corporation did not feel called upon to accord to them the slightest recognition of the high and valuable public services they have rendered, nay even for the dedication of their whole life to the service of the country. If to-day you are honouring me who cannot pretend and who has never pretended to be on the same level with the great names I have mentioned, it is not because, I am what I am, of what I have done or what I have not done, but because I represent in a humble way the same great cause which the great men I have mentioned represented. Taking this honour done to the cause, I accept the honour in all humility and I thank you heartily for it.

### A DEPARTURE FROM PAST TRADITIONS

I shall not on this occasion play the role of those who on former occasions have received addresses in this Hall and elsewhere, by presuming to give you some grandfatherly advice as to what you have done as to what you may do or you may avoid doing in future. That is not the role I have come here to play. I know you have fully deserved the confidence placed in you by your electors and I can only express my confident hope that under the able guidance of your Mayor who is a living sermon of sacrifice and devotion to the country, you may establish a record for this Corporation such as has never been reached before. The poorest of the rate-payers of this Corporation, I hope, will have more rights, more liberty, more conveniences, more comforts than he has enjoyed before. Ladies and Gentlemen, I do not wish to detain you any further and I again thank you most cordially for the honour you have done me to-night.

219. *A Remark about Lord Lytton's Comment, 19 August 1924<sup>1</sup>*

If Lord Lytton has referred to the Char Manair case, which is still "sub judice", he has violated the law. He was thus a criminal. But if it is as it was explained in some quarters, that Lord Lytton has cast aspersions on the womanhood of India then the only word that could describe him was—he is not a gentleman, he is a coward.

Unless his Lordship made an abject and full apology to us who after all are his masters, he must go and go immediately.

220 *Appeal for National Celebration, 3 October 1924<sup>2</sup>*

I commend this resolution to the very serious attention of the country. The great significance of holding public meetings all over the country on the 8th October, the day on which Mahatma Gandhi will break his fast, is self-evident. I take this opportunity to impress upon every man and woman in the country his and her duty to celebrate the 8th October, as the general thanksgiving day for our great leader having been spared to us to lead and guide us in our struggle for liberty. The day should also be observed as marking a definite step towards the resolution of brotherly relations between the various communities inhabiting India. The resolutions passed at the Unity Conference should be read and explained from every platform and acted upon in a spirit of full tolerance to insure peace and harmony in the country.

221. *Suggestions for Union of All Parties<sup>3</sup>*

In pursuance of a resolution passed by the committee appointed by the All Parties Conference at Bombay on the 22nd November, 1924, the undersigned invites the secretaries of all political parties and associations in the country to send the suggestions of their organisations as to the basis on which, in their opinion, union of all parties is possible within the Congress. Suggestions should reach the undersigned before the 20th of December, 1924.

Motilal Nehru

<sup>1</sup>Forward, 20 August 1924. Speech at a protest meeting held in Town Hall, Calcutta to condemn the aspersions cast on the womanhood of India by Lord Lytton in his speech at Dacca.

<sup>2</sup>The Hindustan Times, 5 October 1924. Speech at the Congress Working Committee meeting, Delhi, 3 October 1924.

<sup>3</sup>The Leader, 1 December 1924.

222. *General Council of the Swaraj Party*<sup>1</sup>

It is requested that all Swarajists who have been elected members of the new All India Congress Committee will kindly communicate their names and addresses to the undersigned as soon as possible to enable him to issue the necessary notices of meetings to be held at Belgaum during the Congress week.

Motilal Nehru  
General Secretary

223. *Meeting at Belgaum*<sup>2</sup>

It is proposed to hold a meeting of the Nationalist members of the Legislative Assembly at Belgaum during the Congress week. Members intending to visit the Congress are therefore requested to inform the undersigned of their intention on or before the 15th December.

Motilal Nehru

224. *Hindu-Muslim Question, 12 December 1924*<sup>3</sup>

Now, ever since my return to Allahabad after the recent riots here I have been trying to sound public opinion on the subject. After a great deal of deliberation and after several conferences with the leading Hindu and Mahomedan gentlemen here, I am driven to the painful conclusion that I had to rely not upon the advice that I had received, but upon my own poor resources. I found that the people generally were disgusted with these communal differences and they desired to be restored to peaceful conditions. But the difficulty was how to do that. Now, lately there has appeared a series of articles from the pen of no less eminent an authority than Lala Lajpat Rai in the English-edited press and also a number of notes and articles from the pen of Mahatma Gandhi in *Young India*. I studied these very carefully, but I must confess my inability to find any solution of the matter in any of these writings. I therefore made up my mind to come before you with some practical suggestions. In my humble opinion there is one and only one cause of all the trouble and that is the want of political sense in our people which is due to a series of causes. The first cause is the waning of the Hindu political power and the second is the exclusiveness of the Hindu castes. The decline of the political superiority of the Hindus happened when the Mahomedans came into this country, who undoubtedly came as conquerors. They came with a civilisation of their own quite distinct from the Hindu civilization found in the country. Now the waning of this

<sup>1</sup>Forward, 8 December 1924.

<sup>2</sup>Forward, 8 December 1924

<sup>3</sup>The Leader, 15 December 1924. Speech delivered at a meeting held under the auspices of Macdonnell University Hindu Boarding House Library Union, Allahabad.

Hindu political superiority and the existence in India of a community which held its own naturally gave rise to two hostile divisions. So long as the Hindus saw that they had to deal with a race very much similar and yet very much dissimilar to them in certain matters and that they had to submit to the rule of that race, the points of difference were not so marked as they would have been if the Hindus had their own way. The Hindus became more and more exclusive and the Mahomedans, unfortunately, in India not being able to assimilate the Hindus into Islam, became as exclusive as the Hindus were. The natural consequence was that the two would never come together and if they did, it would be only very temporary. The Hindu prestige again rose high for the moment with the rise of the Mahrattas into power. The British soon came and for the first time in the history of India there came a race which was interested in keeping Hindus and Mahomedans apart. Whether they did so or not is a matter which I leave for personal judgment. I may say with confidence that there is hardly any Indian who doubts that and I say with confidence that there are 90 per cent of Englishmen who believe in it and there are 10 per cent who proclaim to the contrary from the house-tops. The English soon found us fighting against each other and saw that it was easier to govern us than to trade with us. Now, how is it possible for a handful of men like them to undertake the Government of a vast country, with a vast population like India except with the help of the people themselves? If we had political sense enough to understand our own political interests and to unite at least in the prosecution of those interests, why, the English would be nowhere and therefore, I say that it is in the interests of the present ruling race that we should be kept apart. I am not laying the blame at the door of the Government. The blame entirely rests upon the people of this country. It is they who ought to have understood and known that by keeping apart from each other they would be helping the foreigner to have a hold on both of them and keep them under subjection. In course of time, when modern ideas were imbibed by Indians owing to English education, a party of men arose from among our educated men who saw the havoc of this disunion amongst ourselves. In the Indian National Congress we were going on merrily from year to year holding our annual sessions, delivering our speeches and going back home to ponder over them for the next year. Then at the end of the next year there was again a session of the house. That in no way hurt anyone. It was only letting out the superfluous gas. But things changed in the year 1918. Then came the non-co-operation movement. Now, I am not here, again, to justify the non-co-operation movement. I do not believe in politics being mixed with religion at all. Too much talk of religion in connection with politics is to a great extent responsible for the present strained feelings between the Hindus and Moslems.

225. *Speech at Belgaum Congress, 26 December 1924*<sup>1</sup>

Friends,

I will shortly explain to you what I have said in Urdu. I will answer to those objections advanced by Hasrat Mohani and Maulana Azad Sobhani.<sup>2</sup>

I have been saying in Hindustani that those objections do not hold water. Maulana Hasrat Mohani had gone to the length of saying that this House was a packed House of a vast audience and delegates and that everybody is compelled to vote in a certain manner: those who are No-changers, though not asked by Mahatmaji, by high esteem and respect and reverence in which they hold Mahatmaji, feel compelled to vote in favour of the resolution in spite of the fact that Mahatmaji has repeatedly told them not to vote against their conscience. As to the Swaraj Party the objection of Maulana was that the action of Deshabandhu Das and myself was wholly arbitrary and that it was contrary to rules and constitution, because he was under the impression that no meeting of the party was held by which this fact was made a party question. That was a mistake of fact. I have sent a notice round which was circulated broadcast, and to Maulana Saheb who was shown the resolution that I have just now read to this side of the House,—which you might have followed. The resolution was lost by a large majority; it was not a meeting of the Executive Committee, not even of the leaders of the Swaraj Party Council; it was lost by a large majority of the General Council. Then the Maulana proceeded to say that although all that might be true, strictly true, his conscience, though he belonged to the Swaraj Party, did not accept the vote of the majority and he would certainly rise above party because he followed his conscience and his country more than party. But, for that we have to examine his reasons and the reasons he has given are no reasons at all. He says that Mahatmaji said that he suspended non-co-operation and that his experience of this suspension was that it meant the calling off of non-co-operation. The first thing that strikes is that Maulana having joined the Swaraj Party, by the mere fact of joining it he was himself suspending at least one part of the non-co-operation; that is to say, that part which relates to the Swaraj Party: Council-entry. Then it may be borne in mind that the other parts of the programme did not succeed so well as they were expected to. It is but natural that the reason why they did not succeed was because they were not quite prepared. Mahatmaji has therefore suspended the programme, mind you, but not non-co-operation. That is a thing which we cannot conceive—the suspension of non-co-operation itself. But the items of the non-co-operation programme which have been so far considered to be enforced,—they have been suspended; and even if they were not suspended no one practically would be active. Then his other reason was, that this franchise only means that we are pulling down high ideals which we accepted before. The high ideals we accepted before and we have before us is nothing but Swaraj

<sup>1</sup>Report of the Thirty-ninth session of the Indian National Congress, Belgaum, 1924: Speech in support of the Resolution The Agreement & Spinning Franchise.

<sup>2</sup>Maulana Azad Sobhani; b. 1873, rose to prominence in the pan-Islamic agitations in 1913-14, leading local agitator during the Kanpur Mosque agitation; moved complete independence resolution at the All India Muslim League session, 1922; Vice-President, U.P.P.C.C.; after the collapse of the Khilafat movement became a labour agitator in Kanpur, 1924; d. [1926].



and now we are aiming only at the exclusion of British cloth. So that is a fallacy. It is not a matter of saving,—he says, it is not a matter of causing a loss of 15 crores, 40 or 50 crores, whatever it may be, to British who could afford to suffer. But I say it is a question of saving so much money to the country, it is a saving for our poor people, it is a saving for the feeding of the poor. It is only presenting a wrong point of view before you. That is after all a secondary consideration. The real thing is, which is subjected to, the preparation for the very thing which Maulana Saheb declared, viz., the suspension of non-co-operation. These are the few remarks; this is the substance of what is said about Maulana Hasrat Mohani.

Then so far as Maulana Azad Sobham is concerned,—he said it was a very weak case before us. He would not have opposed this resolution if the suspension of non-co-operation were not made, because it differed; as he may be for the franchise wanting any path; he would not be considered it must call upon to oppose the resolution, because he was asked, he expressed his readiness to undertake and run through greater risk if he was commanded by Mahatmaji. That is the reason why he opposed; it was the suspension of non-co-operation. He wanted to go ahead beyond non-co-operation for complete independence. He asked Mahatmaji to permit him to carry on a campaign in the country in favour of complete independence. He said that so far from going forward in that direction Mahatmaji had now suspended non-co-operation itself and limited the extent of freedom or liberty which was the real idea. Just now I have answered that as regards non-co-operation. As regards franchise, he himself says though he differed it is a thing which he had to work if commanded by Mahatmaji as if not by the third part of the resolution.

Now as regards the last speaker, Swami Govindanand.<sup>1</sup> He put a question. He said, "You talk so much on discipline. What has become of that discipline when you differed at Gaya to go into the Councils?" Now, I claim that whatever we did, we did, not as rebels but as a thoroughly disciplined body. We differed from the majority. What did it do? We constituted a compact minority. What again did that minority do? They cultivated opinion, educated public opinion and went on like that till, as Deshabandhu Das pointed out to you, "We stand thoroughly vindicated today". That was perfectly legitimate, perfectly disciplined, and perfectly honest work to do. We went into the Councils. When? When at Delhi the Congress had come to that resolution that those who had not any religious or conscientious scruples to enter into Councils, might do so; and they say that for that they should not be excluded from the Congress. Of course, I am not giving you those very words, but only the substance. Where is the echo of indiscipline? It is very easy to say that it is indis-

<sup>1</sup>Swami Govindanand (J.T. Mantukham), b. 1889, educated at Bombay; Professor, Fergusson College, Poona, 1910, Hislop College, Nagpur, 1911, B.N. College, Patna, 1912 and B.B. College, Muzaffarpur, visited Japan and U.S.A., April 1914; returned to India in the *Komagata Maru*, September, 1914, arrested and detained in jail in connection with *Komagata Maru* affair and Budge Budge shooting case; imprisoned, for taking part in the Rowlatt satyagraha, 1919 and N.W. Railway Employees' first general strike, 1920, worked on the staff of *Young India*, sentenced to five-year transportation, 1921, started the *Daily Kesari* in Karachi; participated in the civil disobedience movement and imprisoned; leader of the left wing Congress Party and its General Secretary; started the *Voice of India*; Vice-Chairman, Reception Committee, Karachi Congress, 1931; d. 1955.

cipline. Those who differ and disagree with this pact, they have a right to vote against it. Not only that. Those who differ from the Swaraj Party may go out of the party, of course, the constitution of the party will not permit them to be in the party and they have perfect right to form themselves into another party and have public opinion and cultivate educated opinion and come into the Congress and claim a majority of their own views. And so, I say, there is nothing wrong.

And the last thing you heard is between the Swarajists and the Non-Swarajists. Please don't attach any importance to them. There are Swarajists and No-changers. I don't say all. But there are some amongst both, to whom, I know, this franchise and agreement is a bitter pill to swallow. Bitter or not, to their credit they have swallowed and if you only give time they will digest it too. So you will not give way to any such and you should not attach any importance to them.

But I am asked by Maulana Mohamed Ali and my friend Deshabandhu Das that they were not correctly understood by Swami Govindanand and my friend Mr. Abhyankar. They did not for a moment say that Mahatmaji was taken to be a mad man at any time. Neither of them believed in spinning, neither of them said that they believed in yarn, in *Khaddar*. All that they said was,—all that Deshabandhu Das said was that now his faith in the *charkha* was growing in him; it was not so about the franchise at the beginning. There is no difference whatever amongst the Swarajists and No-changers over this agreement and also among those who were subsequently consulted about it. The objections that we have heard are very feeble indeed. I would therefore ask you all, Swarajists and No-changers, to vote as one man for this resolution and to prove to my friend, Maulana Hasrat Mohani, that he may multiply the number of those who voted against as many times as he would like and that the test he may apply as he feels; but he won't have any consideration whatsoever.

## 226. *Speech at Belgaum Congress, 27 December 1924*<sup>1</sup>

Friends, the resolution that has been entrusted to me runs as follows; it relates to Kohat<sup>2</sup> and Gulbarga<sup>3</sup>:—

<sup>1</sup> *Report of the Thirty-ninth session of the Indian National Congress, Belgaum, 1924.*

<sup>2</sup> *Kohat Riots*, a serious communal riot occurred in September 1924 at Kohat in the N.W.F.P., a predominantly Muslim area. Relations between Hindus and Muslims had been strained for quite sometime past on account of forced conversions and abduction of women. The immediate cause that led to the outbreak was the publication of a pamphlet by the Sanatan Dharma Sabha, Kohat, containing an anti-Islamic poem. It was said to be a reply to an equally offensive anti-Hindu poem published in a Muslim newspaper. On 10 September, Hindu shops and houses were raided and burnt. Despite information given by Hindus that their lives and property were in danger, Government made no effort to give them protection. Almost the entire Hindu population had to leave the city; later Mahatma Gandhi and Maulana Shaukat Ali made inquiries into the causes of the riot.

<sup>3</sup> *Gulbarga Riots*, a riot broke out in Gulbarga in the Nizam's territory in August 1924. Communal trouble had been brewing there for sometime past and on the day of Muharram, some Muslims entered the Sharan Vishveshwar Temple and caused damage to it. The Hindus retaliated by attacking a mosque. Several temples were desecrated, their idols destroyed and buildings damaged. Subsequently, the Nizam's Government sanctioned Rs 25,000, the estimated cost of repairs to the temples.

'The Congress deplores the Hindu-Muslim tension and the riots that have taken place in various parts of India. The Congress deplores the riots that recently took place in Kohat, resulting in loss of life and destruction of property including temples and gurudwaras, and is of opinion that the local authority failed to perform the primary duty of protection of life and property. The Congress further deplores the enforced exodus of the Hindu population from Kohat and strongly urges the Musalmans of Kohat to ensure their Hindu brethren of full protection of their lives and property and to invite them to return as their honoured friends and neighbours. The Congress advises the refugees not to return to Kohat except upon an honourable invitation from the Kohat Musalmans and upon the advice of Hindu and Musalman leaders. The Congress advises the public, whether Hindu or Musalman, not to accept the finding of the Government of India, as also of others, on the Kohat tragedy, and to suspend judgement till this board appointed by the Unity Conference or some other equally representative body has inquired into the unfortunate event and come to a decision upon it.

The Congress expresses its heartfelt sympathy for the sufferers in the Gulgarga riots and condemns the desecration committed on the places of worship in that town.'

Friends, I do not claim any special knowledge of the facts of the tragedy which is referred to in this resolution. But if I am here to move the resolution it is to commend to your acceptance the principle which it involves. It involves a principle and it states two facts which cannot admit of doubt and which are above controversy. But the facts are: first, in Kohat a tragedy has taken place, the like of which has not been known in India for many years, and indeed I do not remember at least in my life-time, which is not a very small period, of anything approaching tragedy in Kohat. There is no doubt that the Hindu population of Kohat which is in a very small minority has suffered very greatly and grievously. There is no doubt also that an enquiry which took place—a hole and corner enquiry by a person designated as Special Magistrate has been thoroughly inadequate and insufficient and based upon material as to which the public have not been taken into the confidence of the authority.

Those are the two facts. The principle involved is that Hindus and Muhammadans, both have to depend upon themselves for their salvation. No amount of protection under—their benign laws, no amount of police force, no amount of military protection which is always held out before you, can save you unless you try to save yourselves.

You know, what has happened. There are two instances before you one from each extreme of India. You have the tragedy in Kohat and you have the tragedy in Bengal. What has taken place under the Ordinance in Bengal can only be described as another tragedy. Now what is the principle which ought to have actuated the Government? The Government have always undertaken to be the guardian angels, to be the guardian of our lives and property, and, of course, I allow that they are entitled also to guard themselves. That is entirely true. But there is the line clearly drawn. In Bengal where the Government feared the consequences of the activities of anarchical societies, what happened there? There is no enquiry, there is no investigation, all and sundry who may or may not have anything to do with anarchical crime are arrested

and safely consigned to jail. What happened at the other extreme? A painful and heart-rending tragedy took place. I read in one of the English-edited journals whose correspondent visited the locality and gave his impression upon what he saw that the town was recently bombarded and that the whole line of houses was burnt down. You know the loss of lives which has taken place; not only that, temples have been desecrated. Now, there is not the slightest doubt and there can be no two opinions in any reasonable being that the desecration of temples and burning of houses and Hindu property could only have been from the hands of their Muhammadan neighbours and whatever sufferings were entailed on the Muhammadans they could only have been inflicted by the Hindus.

I do not propose to go into the question as to who were responsible for the beginning of the trouble and as to who took the initiative, because it is not the time for us to apportion the blame upon the parties concerned. The resolution is a non-controversial one. It commits the Congress to nothing, neither to the Musalman view nor to the Hindu view. It stands upon such facts as are known and asks for an open enquiry either by the Board which has already been appointed by the Unity Conference or by a similarly representative body appointed by the people of India. It asks you to refuse to accept the finding of the Special Magistrate, because on its own face it is a very defective finding and the higher authorities which have received that finding have themselves admitted that the authorities were at fault. What was at the bottom of the exact nature of the delinquency of the authorities? That again I ask you to determine. In accepting the resolution what I ask you is to accept the principle, the principle being that you will not accept anything that emanate from one party or other or from the Government which is the arbiter of our destinies. Whatever you do, you must accept only the decision of a committee which has the confidence of the public and that is what it advises you, the Hindus and the Musalmans. It advises the Hindus not to go back to Kohat until they are assured of their protection by their Musalman brethren, until the Musalmans request them to go. What does it signify? It signifies that it has been proved that the British bayonets, the British force and the machine guns are not meant to protect the citizens; they are simply meant to perpetuate this Government of force on our people, because it is the people and the people only that suffer. All these resources, the vast military resources of the Government, lie idle. As soon as there is a breath whispered against the Government itself, all the men, honest or dishonest, criminal as well as innocent people—they are all huddled together in jail and there is no possible chance of their being heard by the Government. It is on these broad principles that I ask you to accept this resolution in regard to Kohat as well as Gulbarga.

227. *Vote of thanks at Belgaum Congress, 27 December 1924*<sup>1</sup>

Friends,

I am now going to put a proposition which, I know, must be uppermost in

<sup>1</sup>Report of the Thirty-ninth session of the Indian National Congress, Belgaum, 1924.

the hearts of one and all of you. That is a proposition which is usual in our Congress to be laid before this House, before the dissolution of this House. But on this particular occasion I am quite confident that it is not a mere ceremony that you are performing. What I am saying is to pass a vote of thanks of this House to Mahatma Gandhi.

Gentlemen, you have passed the resolution which was dear to him. He has thanked you for it. He has pointed out to you the implication under which you have laid yourself by passing that resolution. That is no doubt the greatest gratitude and thanks you can give him if you can act up to your undertaking. And, I am perfectly certain that he does not expect from you or care to have a resolution of thanks. But in passing this resolution which on other occasions is merely a matter of formality, I take it that you are responding to the call which he made upon you in his concluding remarks. That call was to the Swarajists, and to the No-changers, and to all others whom it may concern. That was a call that you have to perform your undertaking to the very letter in spirit as well as in matter. Now when I propose this vote of thanks I expect you to say by passing it that you agree to all that Mahatmaji said and that you willingly and cheerfully undertake the responsibility which he has laid upon you. I need not say anything more. I only ask you to pass this vote of thanks by acclamation.

## *228. Appeal to the Country on behalf of the Swaraj Party<sup>1</sup>*

The action of the Governor-General in promulgating the Criminal Law Amendment Ordinance 1924 in Bengal has simplified the political situation. It has laid bare the rooted defects of the much wanted Reforms and of the whole system under which the country is being governed. It has revealed the fact that notwithstanding many professions to the contrary the temper of the British Government continues to be what it was in the pre-reform days and at the time when the Rowlatt Act was passed. On the least provocation the Government is only too apt to resort to terrorism over the head of the Legislature under cover of emergency powers.

The Swaraj Party is at the present moment the target of official attacks and will have to bear the full brunt of reactionary repression. After a personal examination of the situation on the spot Mahatma Gandhi has expressed his complete concurrence with the Executive Committee of the Swaraj Party that the policy of repression commenced in Bengal by the local Government with the sanction of the Governor-General is aimed in reality not at any party of violence but at the Swaraj Party and therefore at constitutional and orderly activity. The fact that persons so far arrested in Bengal are with few excep-

Mahatmaji has given his blessings to the Swaraj Party and entrusted it with the responsibility of carrying on on behalf of the Congress and as an integral part of the Congress organisation all work in connection with the Central and Provincial Legislatures. The Swaraj Party feels happy and proud in assuming this responsibility and confidently undertakes to oppose the advancing tide of repressive reaction in the several Legislatures and the country at large. The advent of a Conservative Government in England with a large majority makes it highly probable that there will be a long and hard struggle. The Party is fully prepared for it. But it is obvious that its efforts will only succeed in the measure in which the patriotic men and women of India lend it their active support and cooperation in the shape of men and money. The time when it was enough to give silent support to the Party which it is conscious it has always enjoyed is gone by. The great moment in the life of the Nation has come. The Executive Committee of the Swaraj Party appeals to all Indians who love the motherland to stand by the Party by openly joining it as members and helping it with funds. We are not anarchists, nor violent revolutionaries, nor secret plotters in the dark. We fight in the open for our rights with non-violent and constitutional weapons. All the violence that there is in this fight is arrayed against us and is on the side of the Government. We take no heed of it and march on full of hope and full of heart.

This appeal is not in the nature of propaganda against any other political party. The Executive Committee of the Swaraj Party has already joined Mahatma Gandhi in making an earnest appeal to all parties to unite against the new danger which threatens all alike. The Swaraj Party welcomes all comrades in arms to whatever party they may belong and is ready to accommodate them as far as possible. With this object in view it has called a meeting of all the Indian elected members of the Central and Provincial Legislatures to meet it in conference at Bombay and arrive at a common understanding. But the only fitting answer to the action of the Government for all parties and individuals to give is to join the Swaraj Party. The opportunities of a people governed against their own will vary in direct proportion to the severity of the repression employed against them. The recent Ordinance superseding the Criminal Law in Bengal is in all conscience as severe a repressive measure as any Government which cares to save its face before the civilised world can adopt with impunity. Shall we not make the best use of the opportunity that Providence has given us? And, can we use that opportunity better than by concentrating all our available forces upon the objective of the attack which is none other than the Swaraj Party? We appeal to the men and women of India to rally round the party. We appeal to the rich to give of their plenty. We appeal to the poor to give their mite. We appeal to both to join the army of fighters for the country's cause.

Motilal Nehru  
General Secretary  
All India Swaraj Party

229, *On Hindu-Muslim Rapprochement*, 12 January 1925<sup>1</sup>

The credit for this happy result belongs to the Musalmans of Nagpur who, in making the generous and self-denying offer to surrender what they conceived to be their rights, have shown a high order of patriotism. Without in the least detracting from that credit I must tell you that this wise decision was arrived at under the guidance of my esteemed friend Maulana Abul Kalam Azad who combines in himself an intense patriotism with a thorough knowledge of the true teachings of Islam. It was he who by his clear exposition of religious principles had dispelled from the mind of the Nagpur Musalmans, the wrong notion that in stopping Hindu music in front of their mosques they were performing a religious duty. Once that notion was dispelled the only question which remained was one of convenience.

This question in itself was serious enough. Hindus as well as the followers of other religions can easily realise the annoyance caused by disturbing sounds when they have to concentrate all their attention on the prayer or worship in which they are engaged. Leave religion alone; such annoyance is equally great when one is engaged in work of any kind requiring concentration of the mind. But no annoyance can be too great to suffer if the country demands it. While therefore we cannot underrate the sacrifice made by the Musalmans we must not omit to express our gratitude to Maulana Abul Kalam Azad to whose guiding genius the Musalmans of Nagpur owe the generous frame of mind in which we find them today. I congratulate not only the Musalmans of Nagpur but those living in all parts of India on their good fortune in having the Maulana Saheb as one of their foremost leaders. It is my earnest wish and prayer that some Hindu divine may arise and authoritatively declare that the playing of music is as inessential to the performance of Hindu religious rites as the stopping of it is to the efficacy of the Muslim prayer. I lay claim to no such authority but have no hesitation in declaring my firm belief that music cannot be an essential part of any religion. I yield to no Acharya or Shastri in my reverence for the true religion of the Hindus but no amount of dogmas or quotations from the Shastras can alter my belief in this respect. I have no right to ask you to share my belief but I have every right to ask reasonable men to take a reasonable view of things. Even if you think that shouting and beating of drums in public thoroughfares is necessary to bring you nearer to your God, I ask you to consider whether the regulations of these noises or their momentary stoppage is a sin of such a heinous character as to be shunned even at the risk of perpetuating your slavery. I must not by these remarks be taken to blame the Hindus of Nagpur for having their own religious convictions. I have merely stated my own views for what they are worth. I take it that the Hindus of Nagpur have gone as far as they could consistently with their conception of their religious duties. But if I can claim no personal authority in these matters, I stand before you today on a much higher ground than any personal authority can take. That higher ground was provided by the resolutions of the Unity Conference held in Delhi which was attended by

<sup>1</sup>The Leader, 17 January 1925. Speech delivered after the settlement of Hindu-Muslim dispute at Nagpur.

representatives of practically all religions in India and among them were learned Pandits and Acharyas. The Hindu members of that Conference called upon their co-religionists to refrain from playing street music in front of mosques in such a manner as was likely to disturb the Musalmans at their congregational prayers. I merely ask the Hindus to follow this wise counsel of the wise men of their own religion. I have no doubt that the people of Nagpur, Hindus and Musalmans, by their friendly and brotherly behaviour towards each other during the ensuing months will so strengthen the unity which has been restored to them today that the 12th of January will come to be observed in succeeding years as the anniversary of a great national event.

I have no quarrel either with the Hindu Sangathan or the Muslim Tanzim, though I do not agree with either. What I am concerned with is the organisation of a Hindu-Muslim Sangathan having precisely the same objects in view for both communities jointly as each of these sectional movements has for its own community. This joint Sangathan will stand between the denominational movements and I have no doubt whatever that in the natural course of evolution it will gradually expand on both sides and absorb the separate sections into one homogeneous whole. Let there be this joint Sangathan in every *mohalla*, in every school, in every college, in every office of your city. Let the Hindu members constitute themselves the guardian of the honour, religion and safety of the Muslim members. Let the Muslim members make it their own business to guard the honour, religion and safety of the Hindu members. Let there be joint Hindu-Muslim unions, clubs, gymnasiums and festivals where all can meet on an equal footing. Accomplish this, and you will have accomplished all that is necessary to make you a great nation.

There are wild rumours afloat. It is said that the Swaraj party in the C.P. has been overawed into accepting office. I had been wondering before I left Allahabad what had happened to overawe the most successful wing of the Swaraj party in India. The two facts that I was aware of were (1) that the Swaraj party, true to its word to the electorate, had brought about a complete deadlock in the C.P., and (2) that the Governor of the province and his subordinates had been trudging the land to tell the *darbaris* and others of the great calamity which the C.P. Swarajists had brought upon the province. All the beneficent measures contemplated by the Government had been thwarted by the Swarajists. There was no hope for the country except by a general disavowal of the Swarajist policy and a return to complete cooperation with the bureaucracy. I had also heard of complaints that the C.P. Council in spite of its Swarajist majority had given a worse account of itself than the Assembly and the other provincial Councils where the Swarajists were in minority. And why? Simply because the C.P. Council was not functioning while other provincial Councils were. Imagine a great wrestler jumping into the arena and challenging all and sundry to a combat. There being no wrestler strong and courageous enough to accept the challenge, the greatest of all wrestlers has no option but to go without a fight. Meanwhile, smaller wrestlers give an exhibition of their dexterity in the art and attention is riveted on them for the time. What is the great wrestler to do to force attention on himself? Is he to go to a chemist and take some drug to purge himself of all excess of strength so as to be on a level with those who can easily find a rival to fight with? Would you



like your great wrestler to weaken himself in this way just to give you some amusement or would you like him to preserve his strength and be ever ready to give battle to the strongest enemy who is lying in wait to pounce upon him the moment he shows symptoms of weakness? I leave it to you to choose between these two courses. What after all is the dire calamity with which we are threatened if the Swarajists persist in their policy of obstruction? It is nothing short of the abolition of diarchy and a reversion to the old methods of government. And what does that signify? Merely this that the bureaucracy will have its own way which, we know, it always manages to have whether there are Ministers or no Ministers. In either case you can only get a few crumbs from the leavings of the bureaucratic table. What the Swaraj party stands for is fresh and wholesome food untouched by the hands of the bureaucracy.

### 230 *A Note for the Swaraj Party*<sup>1</sup>

#### NOTE FOR THE U.P.

In my opinion it is not necessary in the U.P. to carry on an active campaign to enlist members of the Swaraj Party. All that is necessary is to consolidate the results obtained at the last elections to the Congress Committees. I have not yet had a report giving the necessary particulars as to the strength of the Swaraj Party in the Tahsil, District and the Provincial Committees. My instructions were that a register be opened immediately after each election showing the names of the Swarajist and non-Swarajist members of that Committee. So far as I know these instructions have not been complied with. No formal report has yet been made even of the names of the Swarajist and other members elected to the All India Congress Committee from the Province. I think that the time, labour and money already spent should be turned to some good purpose. With this object I now give the following instructions:—

(1) That Tahsil, District, Provincial and All India registers of Swarajist and non-Swarajist members be forthwith completed and submitted to Headquarters.

(2) That full accounts of all remittances made to workers to the end of December last be at once rendered.

(3) That instructions be issued to the Swarajists in each Tahsil, District, and Provincial Congress Committees—

- (a) to resolve themselves into Tahsil, District and Provincial Swaraj Committees,
- (b) to carry on propaganda work among the non-Swarajist members of the said Committees,
- (c) to secure election of Swarajist members to the said Committees at bye-elections.

All this work should be honorary and can be done by the office-bearers and the other prominent Swarajists in the various Committees. The small expenses for stationery etc. can be met by subscriptions paid by members and

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).

small donations collected from the public.

(4) Registers of members should be kept up to date with such changes as may be made being noted from time to time and information given to the Head Office.

This is all that is necessary to maintain the integrity of the Swaraj Party in the various Committees during the present year.

### WORK IN THE COUNTRY

This will be done by newspapers and lecturing propaganda. Arrangements are being made to start a Hindi Daily at an early date. This will be followed by an Urdu Daily in due course. Lecturing propaganda will take the form of—

- (a) Village organisation by establishing Hindu-Muslim Unions or Sangathans and taking the necessary steps to raise the untouchables,
- (b) taking direct charge of Kisan Sanghs and have their grievances ventilated in the Councils through Swarajist members,
- (c) organising public meetings to support important measures of Swarajist members of the Assembly and the local Council.

It will be seen that item (a) is the concern of the Congress as a whole including the Swaraj Party while items (b) and (c) have exclusive reference to the Swaraj Party.

The work detailed above requires an army of workers but no specific details can be laid down before we know what assistance is to be expected from the Congress funds for (a). The work indicated in (b) and (c) will be complementary to the work mentioned in (a). It is therefore not possible to lay down the details of (b) and (c) in anticipation of the decision of the Working Committee of the Congress. I shall take the earliest opportunity after the next meeting of that Committee to frame a scheme. Meanwhile it is requested that the work indicated in the first part of this note be completed without delay. It must be understood that all paid workers engaged for that work will cease to draw their allowances from the end of January. Strictly speaking that work should have been finished by the end of December and the extension of allowances to January is a concession. It should however be borne in mind that paid workers will again be mobilized as soon as the new scheme is ready.

Motilal Nehru  
20.1.25

### 231. Parties in the Assembly and their Work—I<sup>1</sup>

It is to be regretted that the press of upper India has shown a lamentable lack of the sense of appreciating the relative importance of persons and things. It has completely ignored the brilliant defence of the attitude of the Independent party in the Assembly made by no less a person than the leader of the party himself in the course of an interview to a representative of the *Bombay*

<sup>1</sup>The Leader, 26 April 1925.

*Chronicle* I was deprived of the pleasure of reading it till after the Bombay and Madras papers were received at Allahabad and my attention was drawn to it by a telegram from Madras and a letter from Bombay. The controversy started by Mr. Rangachariar in his Bombay speech, had left me cold. As a full account of the work of the Swaraj Party in the Assembly and the provincial Councils was to be shortly published I did not care to disturb my holiday and preferred to leave Mr. Rangachariar to the tender mercies of the chief whip of his own party. But the important pronouncement made by Mr. Jinnah cannot, for obvious reasons, be allowed to remain unnoticed until the report now under preparation can be issued. I owe it no less to him than to the public to present the other side of the shield without unnecessary delay.

When Mr. Jinnah is absolutely convinced about the propriety of the methods adopted and the political sagacity displayed by the Independents and his trusted lieutenant has declared that 'the Independent party is a combination of the best characteristics of the Liberal and Swaraj parties', it would almost seem that no power on earth could save either the Swarajists or the Liberals from being swept away before the rising tide of 'statesmanship and broad national outlook' of the Independent party. The most wonderful feature of this phenomenal rise is that all the 'political sagacity, statesmanship and broad national outlook' behind it were suddenly developed within a few days, if not a few hours, towards the latter end of February last. It therefore becomes necessary to probe the depth of the great wave which threatens to submerge us and trace it to its source. A few plain and unvarnished facts will be of greater help to elucidate the true position of the parties than any number of wise sayings borrowed from British constitutional history. No satisfactory results can, however, be obtained without traversing the entire field of activity since the commencement of the second Assembly in January 1924. I propose, therefore, to deal with the matter in parts so as to make convenient reading.

### THE ONLY ORGANIZED PARTY

As it is desirable to come at once to the main point Mr. Jinnah has attempted to make, it will be necessary to deviate slightly from the logical order of sequence and leave matters not strictly germane to Mr. Jinnah's claim to 'political sagacity' to be dealt with later. At the commencement of the Delhi session of 1924, the only organised party in the Assembly consisted of 43 Swarajists and their three Burmese associates who though not elected on the Swarajist ticket had come with a clear mandate to vote with the Swarajists. The other elected members were either independent of one another or very much dependent on the Government and its friends. With a view to form a coalition informal conversations were in due course started between Messrs Patel, Kelkar, Rangaswami Iyengar and myself on the Swarajist side and Messrs Jinnah, Rangachariar, Ramachandra Rao and Madan Mohan Malaviya on the non-Swarajist side. At the earliest stage of these negotiations I made it quite clear that no coalition was possible unless the non-Swarajists agreed to join in the national demand with the Swarajists and to pursue a policy of obstruction and refusal of supplies in the event of the Government not making a satisfactory response to the resolution putting forward the demand. 'Put

your demand as low as you like," I said, "but once you adopt and put it forward there will be no going back on the policy of obstruction and refusal of supplies in the event of the Government failing to make a response to our satisfaction."

This principle was fully accepted, subject to the condition that no response made by the Government would be treated as unsatisfactory unless it was so decided by a certain proportion of the members. After prolonged discussion a working arrangement was come to and a common programme agreed upon. The drafts were prepared by both parties and eventually the one produced by Messrs Jinnah, Rangaiahariar and Ramachandra Rao was accepted with slight variations. The material portion of it runs as follows: "If the Government do not make a satisfactory response to the resolution demanding reforms within a reasonable time the party will then be bound to a policy of obstruction and will put the policy into operation at the earliest period when demand for grant is made by the Government by refusing supplies, provided that the party decide by a majority of three-fourths at a meeting, specially to be convened for the purpose, that the response, if any, made by the Government is not satisfactory." All members of the Assembly, Swarajists and non-Swarajists, who agreed to this policy signed the agreement and the signatories subsequently formed the coalition known as the Nationalist party. The strength of the party at its inception was the Swarajist bloc of 43, three Burmese and 24 other elected members who came in as individuals with no common ties to bind themselves to one another. These met subsequently and framed the constitution of the Nationalist party which remained in operation for the first year of the new Assembly.

wrong in 1924. We shall, therefore, have to follow the subsequent history of the Nationalist party to determine the exact moment when 'political sagacity' first dawned upon the Independents. To proceed with facts. The demand for responsible government agreed upon was put forward in the form of my amendment to Mr. Rangachariar's resolution on 8th February, 1924. Sir Malcolm Hailey's speech on behalf of the Government was most disappointing and my amendment was carried by a majority of 76 to 48 on 18th February. Thereafter the Nationalist party decided by a majority of three-fourths of those present at the meeting that the response made by the Government was unsatisfactory. Objection to this vote was raised by Messrs Jinnah, Rangachariar and Ramachandra Rao on the ground that the majority under the agreement was three-fourths of the whole party and not merely of those present. On the construction of the agreement I as chairman overruled the objection and that ruling was eventually submitted to.

### 232 *Parties in the Assembly and their Work—III*

We have seen how the Nationalist party came to the conclusion that the circumstances under which it was its duty to refuse supplies had arisen.

A resort to the policy of obstruction was thus finally decided upon and I accordingly moved the total rejection of the demand under the first head Customs when it came up on the 10th March. In doing so I relied upon the principle of 'grievances before supplies' and, after referring to the constitutional results which flow from the application of the said principle in England and other free countries, I explained the position in India as follows:—'We, in this imitation parliament, are doing something in imitation of the real rights of the people's representatives. This has only one result, namely, to bring it to the notice of the Government that so far as we are concerned we have taken the strongest possible step that was open to us. It may be our misfortune but is not our fault that it falls flat and we cannot give effect to the motion as it is given effect to under the rules which prevail in a free country'. Mr. Jinnah did not take part in that debate and gave no indication whatever that he differed from the principle relied upon by me. On the contrary by recording a silent vote for my motion after the speech, he fully identified himself with the principle of obstruction and refusal of supplies in the existing state of the country. My motion was eventually carried by 63 to 56, the Nationalist party voting for it *en bloc*. Mr. Rangachariar had then left for England. The next motion taken up was Mr. Patel's for the total omission of the demand under the head Income-tax and was carried by a bare majority of one. The third motion was Mr. Doraiswami Iyengar's<sup>2</sup> total omission of demand under the head Salt. At this stage, Mr. Ramachandra Rao and Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya approached me and suggested that we should not continue wholesale obstruction. Mr.

<sup>1</sup> *The Leader*, 29 April 1925.

<sup>2</sup> C. Doraiswami Ayyangar; b. 1873, taught in a school for two years; vakil, 1899; President, District Congress Committee; President, Taluk Board and Chairman, Municipal Council, Chittoor; member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1923-29, President, Andhra Provincial Conference, 1928, d. 1938.

Jinnah was with them but while holding that we should not carry on obstruction any further he made it clear that if I insisted on continuing the obstruction he would go on voting with the party so long as he remained a member. I expressed my inability to agree to any change of policy without a clear decision by the requisite majority of the party to that effect. It was then that Mr. Jinnah uttered the historical phrase, 'then we must submit to be led to the slaughter house', which was repeated by Mr. Patel in the last Delhi session. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya abstained from voting on this demand but Messrs Jinnah and Ramachandra Rao voted for the motion. Unexpected support came from other quarters and the motion was carried by 62 to 53. The last vote for the day was taken on the demand under the head Opium and the Nationalist party again as a whole negatived it by 62 to 52, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya having once more allowed himself to drift with the current. It was now past 8 p.m. and the Assembly adjourned to the next day. I had scarcely left the Assembly Chamber when I received Mr. Ramachandra Rao's resignation in writing from the membership of the Nationalist party and the secretary of the party received four or five notices from other non-Swarajist members, intimating their intention to resign if the policy of obstruction was adhered to.

### MISTAKE OF MY LIFE

I issued an emergent whip calling a meeting of the Nationalist party at 9 p.m. to consider the situation. The meeting was attended by a large number of the Swarajists but only four or five non-Swarajist members were present. Mr. Jinnah, Mr. Ramachandra Rao, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and other prominent non-Swarajists did not attend. The Swarajist members, as a whole, and some non-Swarajists also were strongly in favour of continuing the policy begun that morning. In view, however, of the resignations already received and those threatened and the inevitable dissolution of the Nationalist party if we decided to continue that policy, I pleaded earnestly with the members present to save the party from premature death and in a weak moment advised them to take the first day's obstruction as sufficient to establish the principle. It was only in deference to my personal appeal that a majority of members present agreed to adopt the course suggested by me. It may be some consolation to Mr. Jinnah to know that he does not stand alone in making mistakes. I confess that I made the mistake of my life when in my anxiety to save the Nationalist party I relaxed the programme and thus subjected the Swaraj party to the longdrawn agony which followed.

There were mutual felicitations next morning and I made the statement on the floor of the House already quoted in part by Mr. Jinnah. I cannot, however understand how Mr. Jinnah has come to the conclusion that the principle which was maintained by that statement was 'the principle of protest against the constitution and condemnation of policy generally of the Government' as distinguished from the policy of obstruction and refusal of supplies. The principle that I claimed to have established was the one that I had relied upon in my speech of the previous day. What I said was, 'in speaking yesterday on the motion for the total omission of the first demand I made it perfectly clear that

we were pressing that motion in order to establish a principle.' That principle could be none other than the one I have actually stated namely, 'grievances before supplies.' Mr. Jinnah followed me and said: 'I entirely endorse what Pandit Motilal Nehru had said' which can only mean that he endorsed the one principle I had contended for. The rest of his speech was a spirited dissociation of himself and the non-existent Nationalist party from the policy of wrecking and civil disobedience which I shall deal with later. The Swarajists then practically retired from the field and allowed the Independents to play their favourable game of fighting for baubles but promised them their support to defeat the Government on any division that they may demand. The same day a division was called on Mr. Venkatapathi Raju's<sup>1</sup> motion of a hundred rupee cut under the head Forests and it was carried with the help of the Swarajists by 60 to 51. The next day Sir Purshottamdas Thakurdas' cut of rupees 25 lakhs on Railways was similarly carried by 58 to 43. But when it came to another cut of two crores moved by Mr. Venkatapathi Raju, some Independents quietly walked into the same lobby with the Government and Mr. Jinnah abstained from voting. The result was that the Independent's motion was lost by 56 to 58 due to the defection of the Independents themselves. Thus betrayed, the Swarajists refused to take any further part in the game and the debate on the remaining demands for grants degenerated into a revival of the ways of the first Assembly—speaker after speaker getting up to move cuts and then either withdrawing his motion with profuse apologies or allowing it to be negatived without division, thus proving that your present day Independent is only the old Moderate in disguise.

### FINANCE BILL

When the Finance Bill was to come up for consideration a meeting of the party was called the previous evening at which Messrs Jinnah, Ramachandra Rao and Madan Mohan Malaviya, along with several other Independents, were present. The Independents were not prepared to throw out the bill and a few Swarajists with the sole object of keeping the Nationalist party intact voted with them in favour of specific amendments instead of total rejection and the meeting thereupon dispersed. Mr. Jinnah left Delhi the same evening but Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya under some divine inspiration changed his mind overnight and sent word to me early next morning that he was prepared to move the total rejection of the Finance Bill if the Swarajists would support him. I was then in bed but jumped out at once and promised full Swarajist support if Pandit Malaviya would carry some of the Independents with him. This he succeeded in doing and then came the great speech with which he opposed the consideration of the Finance Bill. In the course of that memorable speech he said: 'This, Sir, is the constitutional aspect. So long as the Government of India Act is not revised, I find that with my sense of self-respect, with the little conscience that God has given me, I cannot support taxation either

<sup>1</sup>Bhupatiraju Venkatapathiraju; belonged to Vizianagaram; Chairman, Vizianagaram Municipality; took part in the Home Rule movement; member, Independent Party, represented Ganjam and Vizagapatam constituency in the Indian Legislative Assembly, 1923-26.

now or in future. Take away the Government of India Act, if you please. That is a threat which has often times been uttered by not very responsible and thinking people. But away with the Government of India Act, if you so please. We shall not complain of it, but if you must govern India in the form of a civilised government, let reality be introduced in place of the sham that you have established here.' And then came the fervid peroration: 'We cannot lend our moral support and vote for the maintenance of this taxation unless the representatives of the people of this country have a voice in the expenditure of the money devised by taxation, unless we are put in a position to exercise the same rights and privileges which the members of every Legislature in the world exercise. Unless that is done we cannot support such taxation. I hope the reasons that I have given will satisfy every elected member of this House of the justice of the attitude I have taken and I hope they will lend me their support in order that the present system must be ended as soon as possible and that we may have a regular system of responsible government under which the representatives of the people, men who have the entire confidence of the people may carry on the administration of the domestic affairs of this country. For these reasons I oppose the motion which has been put before the House by the Finance Member, that the Finance Bill be taken into consideration.' Thus was the whole policy of the Swaraj party vindicated out of the mouth of the most eminent Independent in the Assembly.

I followed up Pandit Malaviya and made clear the principle underlying the rejection of the Finance Bill once more. Referring to my speech on the motion to reject the demand under the head Customs I said, 'The hudget came up. We made up our minds to throw it out, not as my honourable friend, the Home Member, has put it in pursuance of the policy of the Swarajists, but because apart from being one of the methods which was in the minds of the Swarajists it was also a well-known constitutional method of putting grievances before supplies'. And to remove all doubt in the matter I added: 'We were not really refusing supplies because it was not in our power to do so.' We were simply doing all that we could do, that is to say, we were refusing to be any part to the granting of supplies which the Government of India wanted in order to run the government of the country without consultation with us and without our having the slightest power to control the executive. This was putting the case at its lowest and yet was as strong an argument as any which Mr. Jinnah can now advance in support of his own peculiar notions of parliamentary obstruction and deadlocks. What else was it I ask, if it was not parliamentary obstruction? Does political sagacity compel ready acquiescence in the usurpation by the executive of the rights of the people? If so, the Swarajists with the Independents joy of their political sagacity. They will have none of it. Happily, however, this political sagacity had not then fully entered the constitution of the Independent party and the Finance Bill was thrown out by 63 to 57



233 *Parties in the Assembly and their Work—III*

It was at the second Simla session that the idea to form an Independent party as an organised wing of the Nationalist party was conceived and draft rules prepared but the new party did not function till the last Delhi session commenced. A Sub-committee was, however, appointed at Simla to revise the rules of the Nationalist party in the light of the draft rules of the new Independent party and the revised rules of the Swaraj party. The Sub-committee consisted of Messrs Kelkar, Patel, Rangaswami Iyengar, Shafi and myself on the Swarajist side and Messrs Jinnah, Rangachariar, Neogi, Ramachandra Rao, Venkatapathi Raju and Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya on the Independent side. This is how we managed to struggle through the first stage of the coalition.

The second stage begins with the last Delhi session with which I shall now deal. The last session began with ominous portents and some of the heat generated in the All-Parties Conference was transmitted to the Assembly Chamber. The Swarajists and the Independents, however, went on working merrily together with occasional passages at arms of little consequence till the railway budget was reached on the 25th February last. Meanwhile the Sub-committee appointed at Simla had met several times and the following revised rule, recommended by it, was adopted by the Nationalist party about the middle of February, Mr. Jinnah as usual being the moving spirit in the matter:—

'Every member of the party (a) shall ordinarily vote on all matters which have been made party question in accordance with the decision of the party arrived at by not less than a two-thirds majority of the members present at a meeting of which previous notice has been given; (b) is expected to be guided on all questions which the party has not considered by the instructions of the executive committee or the emergency committee.

Provided that in the event of the party desiring a resort to a policy of obstruction including refusal of supplies or rejection of finance bills, no such decision shall be taken in the Nationalist party unless both the Swaraj and the Independent parties have separately met in the first instance and decided at their respective meetings to make it a party question. If either group does not desire to resort to a policy of obstruction or of refusing supplies the Nationalist party shall not make it a party question. In that event either group will be free to act as it may determine.'

## FLASH OF VISION

The questions which Mr. Jinnah has to answer on this rule of February 1925 are *mutatis* and *mutandis* the same as has been set out in my first article arising from the agreement of February 1924. I should only like to add the following:—If Mr. Jinnah believed that resort to a policy of obstruction including refusal of supplies and the rejection of finance bills, depended upon the readiness of the country to push that policy to its logical conclusion, and if he knew that the country was not so ready why in the name of commonsense he wasted his time and energy in taking a prominent part in the framing of that rule and

\*The Leader, 2 May 1925.

Mr. Jamnadas Mehta: This might be another.

Mr. Jinnah: This might be another, but Mr. Jamnadas Mehta has never made a mistake in his lifetime and I think he ought to be exported to a higher place.

Mr. Jamnadas Mehta: And you to a lower one."

## HISTORICAL RESEARCH

After this honest admission came the quintessence of historical, constitutional and logical research rolled into one pregnant passage, thus reported in the *Indian Hansard*:—

"We find that it would not be the proper course to refuse supplies, first of all, on the ground that if we adopt this policy—I do not say that the people are not entitled to adopt that policy—we must carry that policy out to its logical conclusion and I, Sir, standing here with all the responsibility that I have to face, say that we are not in a position at present to carry out that policy to its logical consequences.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: Where were you last year?

Mr. Jinnah: You were not and therefore you made a mistake."

But Mr. Jinnah is never at end of his resources. Seeing that the awkward mistake he committed last year was coming in his way at every step, he turned his attentions to Mr. Patel, the *bete noir* of the Government benches. In the hope of enlisting sympathy from that quarter, he said:—

"If I may quote the words of no less a person than Mr. Patel, who occupies a place only second to Pandit Motilal Nehru in the Swaraj Party. He said: 'We will go out into the country and start a campaign of non-payment of taxes'. That is one of the logical consequences.

An honourable member: Did he say that?

Mr. Jinnah: Yes, he did say that. Standing here at present I am unable to endorse this policy."

The very positive statement, 'Yes, he did say that', is entirely wrong and misleading as will be seen later on. It furnishes only one of the many examples of the special politics of Mr. Jinnah which deserves special notice. After a futile attempt to answer other interrogations Mr. Jinnah sought refuge under another Government stunt and talked of the resolution to separate the railways from the general finance as a convention and finally played the part of the good Samaritan to Sir Charles Innes<sup>1</sup> who had failed to make any impression on the House. He said:

this convention and then let us see and then apply our spur.

A voice: Mercilessly.

Mr. Jinnah: As mercilessly as you can

Mr. Rama Ayengar: Grievances before supplies. Apply the spur mercilessly before the supplies.

Mr. Jinnah: Give Sir Charles Innes a chance and then apply your spur mercilessly. If you can do that I shall be with you. Please drop your phraseology 'grievances before supplies'.

A voice: Why?

Mr. Jinnah: Because you don't give a chance under this convention and that is why I don't agree with you.

Mr. Jamnadas Mehta : Have you no grievances?

Mr. Jinnah : I admit we have grievances, innumerable grievances, but I am not in a position to stand up here and approve of the policy of refusing supplies".

### POLITICAL SAGACITY

Here we have the true defence—political sagacity. It has nothing to do with either politics or sagacity and means only a constitutional dislike of the phrase 'grievances before supplies.' Drop it and Mr. Jinnah is ready to go with you the whole way because he believes in the innumerable grievances the country groans under. This is how 'political sagacity' came to possess Mr. Jinnah and his party and my motion to reject the grant to the Railway Board was defeated by 41 to 66, the Independents voting solid against it. Then we came to the cuts on the merits. Some of these were carried and others defeated. Among those defeated was one moved by Mr. Kasturbhai, an Independent, who had the rare privilege of seeing his victory converted into a defeat by the defection of 8 members of his own party while the Swarajists stood by him to a man. The voting was 50 to 54. Had the eight Independents voted with Mr. Kasturbhai the result would have been a decisive victory by 58 to 46. But this was comparatively a small sacrifice on the altar of 'political sagacity.' We next refer to the general budget which will be dealt with in the next article.

#### 234. Parties in the Assembly and their work—IV<sup>2</sup>

The demands for grants under the general budget came up for disposal on the 6th March. The first motion for a cut under the head Excise was moved by Mr. Kasturbhai and related to cotton excise. This was eventually carried as all parties were agreed on it. It is unnecessary to mention the other motions for

<sup>1</sup>K. Rama Ayengar; b. 1872; educated at St. Joseph's College and Law College, Madras; advocate, Madura; President, Madura Cooperative Society and Madura-Ramnad Cooperative Bank; member, Madras Legislative Council, 1914-19, member of the Executive Committee, Madura Tamil Sangam, Secretary and President, Madura Union Club; Secretary, Madura Bar Association; member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1923-26; made a special study of railway matters and financial questions of the Madras and Central Governments; associated with the All India Varnashrama Dharma Swarajya Sangam; d. 1944.

<sup>2</sup>The Leader, 4 May 1925.

Mr. Jamnadas Mehta: This might be another.

Mr. Jinnah: This might be another, but Mr. Jamnadas Mehta has never made a mistake in his lifetime and I think he ought to be exported to a higher place.

Mr. Jamnadas Mehta: And you to a lower one."

### HISTORICAL RESEARCH

After this honest admission came the quintessence of historical, constitutional and logical research rolled into one pregnant passage, thus reported in the *Indian Hansard*:—

"We find that it would not be the proper course to refuse supplies, first of all, on the ground that if we adopt this policy—I do not say that the people are not entitled to adopt that policy—we must carry that policy out to its logical conclusion and I, Sir, standing here with all the responsibility that I have to face, say that we are not in a position at present to carry out that policy to its logical consequences.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: Where were you last year?

Mr. Jinnah: You were not and therefore you made a mistake."

But Mr. Jinnah is never at end of his resources. Seeing that the awkward mistake he committed last year was coming in his way at every step, he turned his attentions to Mr. Patel, the *bête noir* of the Government benches. In the hope of enlisting sympathy from that quarter, he said:—

"If I may quote the words of no less a person than Mr. Patel, who occupies a place only second to Pandit Motilal Nehru in the Swaraj Party. He said: 'We will go out into the country and start a campaign of non-payment of taxes'. That is one of the logical consequences.

An honourable member: Did he say that?

Mr. Jinnah: Yes, he did say that. Standing here at present I am unable to endorse this policy."

The very positive statement, 'Yes, he did say that', is entirely wrong and misleading as will be seen later on. It furnishes only one of the many examples of the special politics of Mr. Jinnah which deserves special notice. After a futile attempt to answer other interrogations Mr. Jinnah sought refuge under another Government stunt and talked of the resolution to separate the railways from the general finance as a convention and finally played the part of the good Samaritan to Sir Charles Innes<sup>1</sup> who had failed to make any impression on the House. He said:

"I entirely agree that there are innumerable grievances. In fact the grievances have accumulated as Pandit Motilal Nehru himself pointed out. They have accumulated for more than a quarter of a century.

A voice: For more than three quarters of a century.

Mr. Jinnah: Now, what is the good, Sir, of making up that old history bare as it is? Now, give the Hon. Sir Charles Innes or his successor a chance under

<sup>1</sup>Charles Alexander Innes; b. 1874; Collector, Malabar, 1911-15; Director of Industries and Controller of Munitions, Madras, 1916-18; Secretary, Government of India, Department of Commerce, 1920-21; member, Viceroy's Executive Council, 1921-27; Governor, Burma, 1927-32; d. 1959.

immediate wants and relieving to some extent your immediate wants at the expense of prolonging your indebtedness. Expert opinion was by no means settled as to which was the more prudent course to follow, but both the Swarajists and the Independents chose to adopt the latter as against the Government proposal to adopt the former.

### MR. PATEL'S MOTION

Let us now follow the debate. The first motion of Mr. Jamnadas Mehta (Swarajist) was to reject this grant in toto. But it is not necessary to go into this as Mr. Jamnadas subsequently accepted Mr. Patel's motion as an amendment to his own. The second motion was that of Mr. Patel who asked for a reduction of Rs. 1,13,40,125. Mr. Patel made out his case as follows:

(a) The rate at which exchange was calculated in the budget on payments to be made in England was 1s. 4d. whereas market rate of exchange was 1s. 6d. Mr. Patel showed that the amount payable for the exchange calculated on the basis of 1s. 4d. exceeded the amounts calculated on the basis of 1s. 6d. by Rs 35,95,000 odd;

(b) The amount provided for the redemption of debt in previous years was four crores only. But for the current year, a sum of Rs 4,77,50,000 was provided in the budget.

Mr. Patel's proposed reduction was for the total of the difference in exchange and the excess over 4 crores.

The third motion was that of Mr. Shanmukham Chetty<sup>1</sup> (Independent) who asked for reduction of the excess 4 crores only. The other point about the exchange had evidently not suggested itself to him. In the course of the debate, however, Sir Purshottamdas Thakurdas, than whom I venture to say there is no able or more practical financier on the non-official side of the House, admitted the soundness of Mr. Patel's contention on the question of the rate of exchange but as he had not himself made the necessary calculation, he was unable to say on what basis the budget calculation was actually made. It was subsequently admitted that the rate adopted in the Budget was 1s. 4d. Sir Purshottamdas Thakurdas made a vigorous speech in support of Mr. Patel's motion and Mr. Shanmukham Chetty was equally convinced of its soundness. It was accordingly arranged that Mr. Jamnadas was to accept Mr. Patel's motion as an amendment to his own and the motion so amended was to be carried by the Nationalist party with the result that Mr. Chetty's motion would drop automatically.

<sup>1</sup>R. K. Shanmukham Chetty; b. 1892 at Coimbatore; educated at Madras Christian College; elected Vice-Chairman of Coimbatore Municipal Council in 1917, member, Madras Legislative Council, 1920-22, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1923-34; Deputy President of the Assembly, 1931, President, 1933; Dewan of Cochin, 1935-41; delegate, International Labour Conferences in Geneva, 1928, 1929, 1930, League of Nations, 1938 and I.L.O., New York, 1941-42; member, Constituent Assembly, 1946-49, first Finance Minister of the Government of India, 1947-48, Chairman, Industrial Finance Corporation, 1949, Vice-Chancellor, Annamalai University, 1951-52, elected to the Madras Legislative Council in 1952; d. 1953.

## MR. JINNAH'S FIAT

Mr. Jinnah who was not in his place for sometime previously came in as the division bell was ringing and gave the order that the only motion to be supported by his party was that of Mr. Chetty. I tried to point out to him that there was no difference of opinion on the subject but he dismissed me with the curt remark that they had fully considered the matter in their own meeting and had decided in favour of Mr. Chetty's motion. Mr. Patel's amendment was, therefore, lost by 43 to 47. The analysis of this voting is interesting. Seven Independents, including Sir Purshottamdas Thakurdas, Messrs Chetty, K. Rama Ayengar and Kasturbhai, all financiers of repute, voted with the Swarajists in spite of Mr. Jinnah's injunction. One Independent voted with the Government and four Independents, namely, Messrs Jinnah, Rangachariar, Venkatapathi Raju and Mohamed Yakub abstained from voting. Thus, it was that one stroke of 'statesmanship', directed with 'political sagacity' converted a certain and pre-arranged victory by 48 to 46 into a defeat by 43 to 47 and brought the Swarajists and the Independents suddenly to the parting of ways.

Swarajists are blamed for making up their minds to vote in a certain way without waiting for the debate and listening to the opposite view which has no effect on them, howsoever ably and convincingly put on the floor of the House. Here we have the leader of the Independent party absent from the chamber during the greater part of the debate, turning up at the last moment and insisting on voting as he had predetermined in spite of the fact duly brought to his notice that stalwarts of his party like Sir Purshottamdas Thakurdas and the other gentlemen I have named had been converted in the course of the debate. There is good reason to believe that the question of the rate of exchange never occurred to and was never considered by the Independent party. But the fiat had gone forth and could not be recalled.

## TIME FOR DRASTIC ACTION

While the voting was in progress I conferred with individual members of the executive and other prominent members of the Swaraj Party in the lobby and came to the conclusion that the time had arrived for drastic action. Having regard to the nature of the demand and the object of the motions for cuts discussed above, I was fully satisfied that the vote of the House on this particular head one way or the other could not affect the tax-payer to any appreciable extent. It was indeed a case of six of one and half a dozen of the other. Any little harm that could possibly ensue by the locking up of a large sum of money than was necessary was, in my opinion, likely to be more than counter-balanced by drawing the pointed attention of the country to the tyranny of a handful of Independents and to the manner in which they impeded the progress of the serried column of the Swarajists. I accordingly decided to abstain from voting on the motion of Mr. Chetty which by reason of the defeat of Mr. Patel's motion was to be taken up next. The result was an ignominious defeat of the Independents by 14 to 46 despite the fact that a staunch Swarajist had by mistake found his way into their lobby and two non-party men had voted with them. There was some press criticism on this result being announced

amidst Swarajist cheers. I am unable to see the point of this criticism. If the Swarajists were right in abstaining from voting, as I have shown they were, I see no reason why they should not have expressed their satisfaction at the result. The next division was taken on the main Government proposition which was carried by 54 to 39. The Swarajists, in a body, voted against the whole demand. Six Independents voted in favour of the demand, the others remaining neutral. The net result of this debate and the voting thereon ought to give complete satisfaction all round. The parties concerned have all gained more than they have lost. The Government lost the honours of the debate but gained its point. The Swarajists lost their motion but gained, besides the honours of the debate, accession of 3 important Independents to their party. The Independents lost their motion and on top of it, three of their important members, but gained in 'political sagacity'. The taxpayer lost some slight temporary relief but gained the valuable knowledge that for true friends devoted to his cause he had to look to the Swarajists and Swarajists alone.

### 235. *Reply to an Address*<sup>1</sup>

Mrs. Bholanath<sup>2</sup> and others of the superior sex,

I am obliged to you for the address that has just been read. I shall treat it as a valued souvenir and it shall go to my children and children's children as an heirloom so that they may learn by the mistakes of their ancestor. You have placed me in a great difficulty. My sense of chivalry extends to the whole of the superior sex and I know that there are those in it who admire me and not merely my late moustache. It is impossible for me to say at the present moment what the result of a plebiscite of the whole sex will be. While I appreciate the sentiments you have expressed I must find means of consulting those who have not signed this address. Being accustomed to the procedure in the Assembly I can only think of the very familiar motion that the Bill be circulated for opinion. Meanwhile I promise you that it will have my earnest consideration. (Here Sir Mohamed Shafi whispered something to the speaker who continued) My friend Sir Mohamed Shafi who has not yet shaken off the dust of office suggests another official formula and I gladly accept it. It is that I shall grow my moustache again if it is necessary in the public interest. I hope this will satisfy you. I thank you again for the interest you have taken in my moustache. I hope I shall live to interest you in me as I am.

their subscriptions for the new year, saving sub-section (1) shall not affect the rights of those who have been already registered as members under the Article repealed, provided their membership is otherwise in order and provided further that those who shall have paid yearly subscription, whether of selfspun or handspun yarn, up to September 1925 shall be entitled to remain members for the current year though they may not pay any further yarn.

(b) Whereas the Congress in its 39th session, held at Belgaum, endorsed an agreement entered into between Mahatma Gandhi on the one hand and Deshbandhu C.R. Das and Pandit Motilal Nehru acting on behalf of the Swarajya Party on the other, whereby the Congress activity was restricted to the constructive programme mentioned therein, and it was provided *inter alia* that the work in connection with the Central and Provincial Legislatures should be carried on by the Swarajya Party on behalf of the Congress and as an integral part of the Congress organisation and that for such work the Swarajya Party should make its own rules and administer its own funds.

And whereas subsequent events have shown that this restriction should not continue under the altered circumstances that face the country and that the Congress should henceforth be a predominantly political body;

It is resolved that the Congress do now take up and carry on all such political work as may be necessary in the interest of the country and for this purpose do employ the whole of the machinery and funds of the Congress, save and except such funds and assets as are specially earmarked and belong to the All-India Khaddar Board and Provincial Khaddar Boards which shall be handed over with the existing financial obligations to the All-India Spinners' Association to be administered by it on behalf of the Congress and as an integral part of the Congress organisation but with independent powers and existence, provided that the work in the Indian and Provincial Legislatures shall be carried on in accordance with the policy laid down by the Swarajya Party under the constitution framed by the Party and the rules made thereunder subject to such modifications made by the Congress as may be found necessary from time to time for the purpose of carrying out the said policy.

### 237. *On Crisis in the Swaraj Party, 19 October 1925*<sup>1</sup>

You will be naturally anxious to hear something from me about the recent events which have, to a certain extent, disturbed the even tenor of our political activities. Rebellion has undoubtedly raised its unruly head in certain parts of the Swarajist organisation, but there is no real danger of the solidarity of the Party being impaired in any way. I, for one, welcome this rebellion, as nothing could more effectively enable us to separate real gold from dross or shall I say copper which we call *tamba* in Hindi. That there has been not only a gross breach of discipline but also a very serious breach of faith on the part of Mr. Tambe in accepting a Government post admits of no doubt whatever, and

<sup>1</sup>The *Hindustan Times*, 23 October 1925. Speech at a meeting of the provincial committee of the Swaraj Party held at Satapur.



236. *Resolutions moved at AICC meeting, Patna, 22 September 1925*<sup>1</sup>

(a) In view of the fact that there is a demand from a considerable section in the Congress for a revision of the franchise and there is a general consensus of opinion that having regard to the present situation the franchise should be extended, the All-India Congress Committee resolves that Article V of the Congress constitution be repealed and replaced by the following Article:

Every person not disqualified under Article IV and paying a subscription of 1 anna per year in advance or 2000 yards of evenly spun yarn of his or her own spinning shall be entitled to become a member of any primary organisation controlled by a Provincial Congress Committee, provided that no person shall be a member of two parallel Congress organisations at one and the same time.

The yarn subscription mentioned in sub-section (1) shall be sent direct by the spinner to the secretary of the All-India Spinners' Association or to any person nominated by the secretary of the All-India Spinners' Association, who will issue a certificate to the effect that he has received 2000 yards of evenly spun yarn of the holder's own spinning as his or her yearly subscription. This shall entitle the holder to the membership mentioned in sub-section (1) hereof, provided that for the purpose of checking the accuracy of the returns made by the All-India Spinners' Association, the A.I.C.C. or any P.C.C. or any sub-committee thereunder shall have the right to inspect the accounts, the stock and the vouchers of the All-India Spinners' Association or any subordinate organisation thereunder, and provided further that in the event of any inaccuracy or error discovered by the inspecting body in the accounts, stock or vouchers examined the certificates issued by the All-India Spinners' Association in respect of persons with reference to whose membership the accounts have been examined shall be declared cancelled, provided that the All-India Spinners' Association or the person disqualified shall have the right of appeal to the Working Committee. Any person wishing to spin for the membership of the Congress may, if he or she desires, be supplied upon due security with cotton for spinning.

The year of the membership shall be reckoned from the 1st January to the 31st December and there shall be no reduction in the subscription to be paid by the members joining in the middle of the year.

No person shall be entitled to vote at the election of representatives or delegates of any committee or sub-committee or any Congress organisation whatsoever, or to be elected as such or to take part in any meetings of the Congress or any Congress organisation or any committee or sub-committee thereof, if he has not complied with sub-section (1) hereof or does not wear handspun and handwoven *khaddar* at political and Congress functions or while engaged in Congress business.

All the existing members at the end of the year shall be entitled to remain such up to the 31st January following although they may not have paid

<sup>1</sup>The *Hindustan Times*, 24 September 1925.

way of the popular view being laid officially and authoritatively before Parliament. No harm was done in that particular case as the nomination was not worth accepting, even if there had been no positive rule against it. But the possibility of future harm was clearly suggested by the inflexibility of the rule, as it then stood.

### RULE REVISED

At the next revision of the rules which took place in June 1924 at Simla, I accordingly proposed the following provisional rule:—

“Provided that the Party may for special reasons decide by a majority of three-fourths of the members present at a meeting to permit any member or members to serve on any particular committee appointed by the Government.”

This was fully discussed informally with many members and formally at a meeting of the executive and was finally adopted by the unanimous vote of the whole party.

One year later I received the offer of a membership of the Indian Sandhurst Committee generally known as the Skeen Committee. For reasons stated by me in the course of a press interview given a few months ago I was of opinion that I should accept the offer subject of course to complying with the rule as altered. But before giving any reply I wired to all the members of the executive of the General Council as also to the members of the executive of the Party in the Assembly and as an additional precaution sought the advice of Mahatma Gandhi. With the exception of two members of the executive of the Assembly all other members of both executives including Mr. Kelkar strongly advised me to accept and Mahatmaji was equally strongly in favour of acceptance. After receiving these replies I wrote to the Military Secretary to the Government of India saying that I could not give a definite reply without consulting the whole party in the Assembly but that I thought it was a fit and proper case to be laid before the Party for its sanction. You will remember that the Government communique announcing my name as a member contained the words, “subject to the approval of his Party”.

### SANCTIONED BY PARTY

After this I laid the matter before the Executive Committee of the General Council held in Calcutta in July last as a preliminary to its being put before the General Council itself. The Executive Committee was, however, of opinion that the requirements of the rule would not be satisfied by the sanction of the General Council, as the word ‘party’ in the new proviso to the rule clearly referred to the party in the Assembly and not the general party. The executive, however, passed an unanimous resolution authorising me to accept the offer in anticipation of the permission of the party in the Assembly. The matter was accordingly brought up at the very first meeting of the Party held on the opening of the last Simla session. The meeting was fully attended and [it] un-

will, I hope, be adequately dealt with by the executive of the General Council in consultation with the provincial committee of the Swaraj Party in the C.P. and Berar at the meeting which had been called for the 1st November at Nagpur.

### AGAINST DISCIPLINE

What is most disappointing is that certain other prominent members of the Swaraj Party have taken it upon themselves to pronounce opinions which are highly improper and clearly bring them within the disciplinary jurisdiction of the Party. I can understand a member of an organisation who disagrees with the policy and programme of that organisation trying to introduce such modifications as he considers necessary by a resort to the well-known methods open to all members to bring about a reconsideration of that policy and programme. If he fails to carry the party with him in such matters he ought to submit to the opinion of the majority but if he feels himself unable to do so for any reason he should, like an honourable man, retire from the party and then criticise it in the public press. The conduct of a person in trying to bring his own party into ridicule and contempt while he enjoys all the privileges of membership cannot be too strongly condemned and the gravity of the offence is considerably enhanced when the offending member happens to hold the position of a leader in a province. I lost no time in issuing a press statement on a telegraphic summary published in the Allahabad papers of the interview given by Mr. Jayakar to a representative of *The Indian Daily Mail*. I saw in the papers while I was travelling to Sitapur another interview to a representative of the same paper given by Mr. N.C. Kelkar. I shall take this opportunity of dealing with it. Mr. Kelkar goes one better than Mr. Jayakar, and after actually congratulating Mr. Tambe for his defection puts his acceptance of office on the same footing as the acceptance by me of the membership of the Skeen Committee.

### SKEEN COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The full facts in connection with this have never been published in the papers though Mr. Kelkar has all along been well aware of them. To explain the matter fully, I shall have to begin with the appointment of the Muddiman Committee. It will be remembered that I put my refusal to accept membership of that Committee on two grounds. The first was that I was precluded from accepting by the rules of the Party, and the second was that having regard to the very narrow terms of reference, I would not have felt justified in accepting, even if there was nothing in the rules to prevent it. Both these grounds were perfectly sound and the minority report has shown that those who were parties to it were compelled to refrain from making any definite recommendations, as by doing so they would necessarily have gone beyond the scope of the reference. It struck me at the time that had these terms of reference been wide enough to meet all the requirements of the case, the positive rule against the acceptance of nominations to membership of committees would have operated adversely to the interests of the Party and of the country, as it would have stood in the

crowds to come together again and make a noise loud enough to reach the sleeping ears of John Bull. The ultimate necessity to resort to Civil Disobedience must therefore not only be constantly kept in view in working our programme but must be thoroughly impressed upon public mind day after day.

### A PLEA FOR ALL TO JOIN CONGRESS

But I am willing to give my friends the same liberty of opinion and action as I expect them to give me. Let them come into the Congress with their settled faith in constitutional agitation and let them convert us to their faith if they can. The Congress is open to all who will avail of the new franchise and subscribe to its creed whether they believe in Civil Disobedience or not. We are prepared to extend a hearty welcome to those who will enter whatever their views if they will only work with us as far as they can.

#### 239. *Remarks on Government's Statement on Electoral Disqualification, 22 October 1925*<sup>1</sup>

Lords Birkenhead and Reading have been insisting on co-operation as a condition precedent to any advance in Self-Government and both have assured us that they would not be niggardly bargainers if the necessary co-operation were available. I wish to tell the noble Lords that they can expect no more than what they have continued to get by the simple expedient of declaring repeatedly that formal and final decisions have not yet been reached and at the same time preparing us for the worst by expressing informal *ad interim* decisions which leave no doubt as to what the formal and final decisions are going to be. We never had any illusions in the matter but gave Government what is known as the full length of the rope. They have made good use of it and co-operation lies dead in its coffin.

The statement issued by Government and published in today's papers refusing to give effect to the very reasonable resolution of the Assembly recommending removal of the electoral disqualification of political prisoners is the first nail that has been driven into the coffin. The other nails are in Lord Reading's pocket and will be driven in before long. The so-called final decisions cannot be indefinitely postponed. They must come before His Lordship leaves the shores of India and when they come the last nail will be driven in. We Swarajists have sailed as near the wind as we possibly could. We can sail no nearer and are only waiting for a mandate from the Cawnpore Congress to abandon the perilous course and take again to familiar waters. I can tell you that I have the terms of that mandate very clear in my own mind. I shall ask for it and have no doubt that the Congress will give it. I may not at this stage tell you what those terms are but there is no harm in telling you what they are not. They are not in the nature of the co-operation that their Lordships desire.

<sup>1</sup>The *Bombay Chronicle*, 26 October 1925. Speech delivered at a public meeting in Kanpur.

animously accorded the permission required by the proviso.

These are the facts and I leave you and the country to judge if there is any analogy between the open and straightforward course adopted by me for the good of the country in more than strict compliance of the rules of the Party and the secret intriguing of Mr. Tambe with the Government for his own personal aggrandisement in open defiance of the very positive prohibition imposed by the rules on him.

The lapses which have occurred are very regrettable, but if the heart of the Party is perfectly sound, as I fully believe it is, there is no reason for alarm. You may be sure that the discipline of the Party will be upheld at every cost.

### 238 *On the Question of United Congress, 20 October 1925<sup>1</sup>*

I for one cannot conceive even the remotest possibility of the success of any agitation unless there is some sanction behind it. I am free to confess that there is no such sanction at present and that we are not now in a position to resort to Civil Disobedience of any kind. I will also concede that there is little likelihood of our acquiring sufficient strength to resort to it in the immediate future, but that is besides the point. What is pertinent to enquire is whether there is any other substitute for an armed revolt which can be made available to us at some time or other. Our friends are unable to point to any. That being so they do not either believe in the necessity of a sanction or have not thought out their programme to its logical end. They merely insist on a united India formulating a united demand for freedom and they seem to think that it will come for the asking. This in plain English means that they have more faith in alien government than in themselves. They believe that once a united demand supported by numerous public meetings in India is made the conscience of the British public will be aroused and they will get as they want. They refuse to consider as a possible eventuality what I believe to be a certainty that the conscience of British public cannot be so easily aroused. The Britisher only knows the logic of a thumping blow which he cannot resist. It is immaterial to know whether it is a physical blow delivered by physical force or one which without the use of any physical force makes life in India unbearable for him. I remember a line of a Persian couplet which is exactly opposite. It is *Hazaran zaghra ek hush kifait* which means "you have only to shout loud enough to put thousands of noisy crows to flight". What is a united demand by a united India without a sanction behind it except the noise of a gathering of millions of crows which can be instantly dispersed by the sound of a few rounds of blank fire. What our friends say is that you must not talk of Civil Disobedience before the country is ready for it. I repeatedly ask: Is there any chance of the country ever getting ready for it if you continue to be afraid to utter the word? Our preparation is not to be commenced today. What will be the propitious moment to begin it in future? Will it be after all the crows have been put to flight? I am afraid it will then be impossible even for the

<sup>1</sup>The Bombay Chronicle, 23 October 1925. Speech at a public meeting in Lucknow.

We know the consequences and are ready for them.

240 *A Plea for Unity, 25 October 1925*<sup>1</sup>

You have invited me to perform the solemn ceremony of unfurling the national flag. Before I do so, I wish to impress upon you the full significance of the function and the great responsibility you and I are undertaking by taking part in it. You have to realise what this flag represents and be prepared to render the service it demands. It represents Swaraj, the Swaraj of all Indians, Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians, Jews, Parsis and all other communities and religions to be found in India. It has three colours, white, green and red. White at the top is emblematical of the unity of all classes, races and creeds in India. As a beam of light is the blend of the colours it shows on passing through a prism, so is the white on the flag symbolic of the unity of all the diverse classes, races and creeds in India. Green and red placed below the white represent the two major communities which form the bulk of the population, namely, the Muslims and the Hindus. The flag thus represents a united India.

And what is the service it demands? Nothing less than the complete realisation of the unity of which it is the symbol. Swaraj is only another name for this unity for no power on earth can withhold it from you once you unite yourselves into one great Indian nation. It is the duty of all those who take part in the function to put that unity above everything else, above all worldly possessions, above life itself, and I may add, above even religion in the name of which so many atrocities are being committed to-day. Your highest religion henceforth is to discharge the duty you have undertaken to-day and to strive for the unity which will bring you Swaraj, so that your religion and your honour may thereafter remain in your own safe keeping. In the name of that unity I now unfurl the national flag and declare that the site on which it stands shall be known as Tilak Nagar after the great patriot who gave us the motto, 'Swaraj is our birthright.'

241. *An Appeal for Votes*<sup>2</sup>

It was with great reluctance that I permitted Seth Govind Das to leave the Assembly and stand for election to the Council of State as the Swarajya party in the Assembly could ill afford to lose his valuable services. I consented to do so only on the insistence of Swarajist friends who considered it highly desirable in the interest of the Central Provinces. The nature of the work done by the Council of State during the last 5 years is too well-known to require any comment from me. When it is remembered that the wisdom of the majority of

<sup>1</sup>The *Hindustan Times*, 28 October 1925, Speech at a function in Kanpur on the site chosen for the Kanpur Congress session.

<sup>2</sup>The *Hutanada*, 12 November 1925. Appeal issued to the C.P. Electors of the Council of State.



*Motilal Nehru with Mahatma Gandhi*



*Seated from left to right: C.K. Das, Motilal Nehru and Hakim Ajmal Khan  
Standing from left to right: Prafulla Chandra Ray and Dr. Kirtidhankar Ray*



*Motilal Nehru, 1924*





*A family group at Anand Bhawan, Allahabad, 1925. Seated from left to right - Swarup Ram Nehru, Motilal Nehru and Kamala Nehru. Standing from left to right - Jawaharlal Nehru, Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, Krishna Nehru, Indira Nehru and Ranjit Pandit.*



*Motilal Nehru with Sarojini Naidu (sitting) and Rameshwarai Naidu (standing).*

the elders who have graced the benches of the Upper House for five years did not permit them to endorse even the national demand twice put forward in the Assembly and not only carried by a large majority on each occasion but whole-heartedly supported by the whole of nationalist India it becomes superfluous to mention the *other* exploits of these "sane and sober" men. What is wanted in the Council of State is men of sturdy independence thoroughly imbued with the spirit of nationalism. I have no hesitation in saying that Seth Govind Das fulfils these qualifications in a pre-eminent degree. I need hardly mention that in addition to these essential qualifications Seth Govind Das being a worthy scion of the distinguished family of the late Raja Gokuldas<sup>1</sup> of Jubbulpore the premier landholder and *raja* of the province will be a most suitable representative of landholding and agricultural and mercantile classes in C.P. I therefore commend his candidature to the acceptance of the entire electorate and appeal to all voters to cast their votes for him.

242. *Resolution on New Political Programme, 27 December 1925<sup>2</sup>*

[Motilal Nehru first explained the resolution in Hindustani.]

This Congress confirms part B\* of Resolution I passed by the All India Congress Committee at its meeting held at Patna on the 22nd September last and resolves that the Congress do now take up and carry on such political work as is necessary in the interests of the country and for this purpose do employ the whole of the machinery and funds of the Congress save and except such funds and assets as under that resolution have been declared to belong to the All India Spinners' Association, and save such funds and assets as may be earmarked.

This Congress reiterates its faith in Civil Disobedience as the only effective weapon to be used in the last resort to enforce the national claim and vindicate our national honour, but realizes that the country is not now ready for it and in view thereof this Congress resolves that the guiding principle in carrying on all political work shall be self-reliance in all activities which make for the healthy growth of the nation and resistance to every activity governmental or other, that may impede the Nation's progress towards Swaraj;

And this Congress adopts the following programme of political work:—

I. The work in the country shall be directed to the education of the people in their political rights and training them to acquire the necessary strength and power of resistance to win those rights by carrying out the constructive programme of the Congress with special reference to popularising the spin-

<sup>1</sup>Raja Gokuldas; b. 1838, grandfather of Seth Govind Das; owner of textile mills; ruler of modern Jabalpur; awarded the title of 'Raja' in recognition of his services and *raja*; Chairman, Maheshwari Mahasabha, Amraoti; d. 1908.

<sup>2</sup>Report of the Fortieth session of the Indian National Congress, Kanpur, 1925.

\*The following is part B of the A.L.C.C.'s resolution referred to above: Whereas the Congress in its 39th session held at Belgaum endorsed an agreement entered into between Mahatma Gandhi on the one hand, and Dr. Bhabhabhai C.R. Das and Pandit Motilal Nehru acting on behalf of the Swaraj Party, on the other, whereby the Congress activity is re-directed to the constructive.

ing wheel and *khaddar*, promoting inter-communal unity, the removal of untouchability, ameliorating the condition of the suppressed classes and the removal of the drink and drug evil programme mentioned therein and it was provided *inter alia* that "the work in connection with the Central and Provincial Legislatures should be carried on by the Swaraj Party on behalf of the Congress and as an integral part of the Congress organisation and that for such work the Swaraj Party should make its own rules and administer its own funds"; and

Whereas subsequent events have shown that this restriction should not continue under the altered circumstances that face the country and that the Congress should henceforth be a predominantly political body;

It is resolved that the Congress do now take up and carry on all such political work as may be necessary in the interest of the country and for this purpose do employ the whole of the machinery and funds of the Congress, save and except such funds and assets as are specially earmarked and such funds and assets as belong to the All India Khaddar Board and Provincial Khaddar Boards which shall be handed over with all existing financial obligations to the All India Spinners' Association started by Mahatma Gandhi as an integral part of the Congress organisation but with independent existence and full powers to administer those and other funds for the fulfilment of its object;

Provided that the work in connection with the Indian and Provincial Legislatures shall be carried on in accordance with the policy and programme laid down by the Swaraj Party under the Constitution framed by the Party and the rules made thereunder, subject to such modifications made by the Congress as may be found necessary from time to time for the purpose of carrying out the said policy and shall include the capture of local bodies, the organisation of villages, the promotion of education on national lines, the organisation of labour both industrial and agricultural, the adjustment of relations between employers and workers and between landlords and tenants and the general advancement of the national, economical, industrial and commercial interests of the country.

II. The work outside the country shall be directed to the dissemination of accurate information in foreign countries.

III. This Congress adopts on behalf of the country the terms of the settlement offered to the Government by the Independent and Swarajya Parties of the Assembly by the resolution passed on the 18th February 1924, and having regard to the fact that the Government have so far not made any response to the said offer, resolves that the following action shall be taken:

1. The Swarajya Party in the Assembly shall at the earliest opportunity invite the Government to give their final decision on the said terms and in case no decision is announced before the end of February or the decision announced is held not to be satisfactory by a Special Committee consisting of the Working Committee of the Congress and such other members as may be appointed by the A.I.C.C., the Party shall by adopting the proper procedure, intimate to the Government on the floor of the House that the Party will no longer continue to remain and work in the present Legislatures as heretofore. The Swarajist members of the Legislative Assembly and the Council of State,

shall vote for the rejection of the Finance Bill and immediately after, leave their seats. The Swarajist members of such Provincial Councils as may be in session at the time shall also leave their seats and all members of the various Legislatures on leaving their seats shall report themselves to the Special Committee aforesaid for further instructions. The Swarajist members of such Councils as are not in session at the time shall not attend further meetings of the said Councils and shall likewise report themselves to the Special Committee.

2. No member of the Swarajya Party in the Council of State, in the Legislative Assembly or in any of the Provincial Councils shall thereafter attend any meeting of any of the said Legislatures or any of their committees except for the purpose of preventing his seat from being declared vacant and of throwing out the Provincial Budget or any other measure involving fresh taxation:

Provided that prior to their being called upon to leave their seats it shall be open to Swarajist members of the various Legislatures to engage themselves in such activities in their respective Legislatures as are permissible to them under the existing rules of the Party:

Provided also that it shall be open to the Special Committee to allow the Swarajist members of any Legislature to attend the said Legislature when such attendance is in its opinion essential for some special or unforeseen purpose.

3. The Special Committee shall immediately on receipt of the Reports mentioned in sub-clause I call a meeting of the All India Congress Committee to frame a programme of work which shall be carried out by the Congress and Swarajya Party organisations in co-operation with each other throughout the country.

4. The said programme of work shall include selected heads of the general work mentioned in clauses I and II above as also the education of the electorate in the policy herein laid down and shall indicate the lines on which the next general elections is to be run by and in the name of the Congress and state clearly the issues on which Congressmen shall seek election:

Provided that the policy of non-acceptance of offices is the gift of the Government shall continue to be followed until in the opinion of the Congress a satisfactory response to the terms of settlement aforesaid is made by the Government.

5. This Congress hereby authorizes the executives of the several Provincial Congress Committees to select candidates for the Provincial Legislative Councils and the Indian Legislative Assembly in their provincial areas for the general elections next year as early as possible.

6. In the event of the final decision of the Government on the terms of settlement offered in the resolution of the Assembly aforesaid being found satisfactory and acceptable by the aforesaid Special Committee, a meeting of the All India Congress Committee shall forthwith be held to confirm or reject the decision of the Special Committee and to determine the future course of action.

7. Until the Swarajists leave the Legislatures as herein provided, the Constitution of the Swarajya Party and the rules made thereunder shall be followed in the Legislatures subject to such changes as may be made by the Congress or the All India Congress Committee from time to time

estimate of Mahatma Gandhi is. I am simply asking you to remember that today Malaviyaji is quoting from the speech of Mahatma Gandhi delivered in 1919 and commending that speech to you; but he is giving the go-by to all that Mahatma Gandhi has said from 1919 up to this day. That was my argument and that argument has not been controverted. But my friend says that the answer to that is that if Mahatma Gandhi were here and listened to the brilliant argument that has been addressed to you then there is no doubt at all that he (Mahatma Gandhi) would have disabused his mind of all those things that have been said during the last three or four years. Is that a fair argument? It is a most dangerous thing thus to be told to make up your mind—not what you yourself think of a question but you must first try to picture in your mind how Mahatma Gandhi would have taken a certain measure and what opinion he would have formed and then you must form the same opinion. I now say simply I have no regard for what has been said. I simply refer you to Mahatma Gandhi's later utterances. I never claim that Mahatma Gandhi has agreed to or accepted my resolution. I had no intention of saying so. But now that my friend Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya has made an observation, I say and I declare that those parts of the resolution which speak of Civil Disobedience and other things, which Malaviyaji has criticised, have the fullest concurrence of Mahatma Gandhi.

*PRESS STATEMENTS AND INTERVIEWS*

244. *Bulletin issued to the Press*<sup>1</sup>

The committee appointed at Gaya to draft the programme of work and rules and regulations of the Congress-Khilafat Swarajya Party will meet at Bombay about the 20th January. Meanwhile a rough draft is being prepared by a small committee including Mr. C.R. Das and Babu Bhagwan Das which is sitting at Benares to sketch out a general outline of the nature and the form of Swarajya.

A general meeting of the workers and the proposers of the party will be held at Allahabad during the 1st week of February to consider and finally pass the programmes and the rules. Congressmen agreeing with the aims and objects of the party and wishing to take part in the discussion are requested to communicate with Pandit Motilal Nehru.

245. *Views on the Congress Split, 15 January 1923*<sup>2</sup>

Q. What is your view, Sir, of the differences which have arisen in the Congress Camp?

A. I think the inevitable has happened. The two schools of thought, which you now see sharply divided on certain points, have existed from the very commencement of the N.C.O. movement. The unifying presence of Mahatma Gandhi which held them together having been withdrawn for the time being the only possible result has followed. Had Mahatmaji been present he would either have been convinced of the desirability of the change we advocate or would have succeeded in convincing us that it was not desirable. We would in any case have had the satisfaction that our arguments had been considered on the merit and in the light of experience instead of having back numbers of *Young India*<sup>3</sup> flung in our face in and out of season. Had no agreement been possible he would in all probability have hit upon a more effective substitute for our suggestions than the milk and water to which the Gaya Congress has treated us.

Q. Is not this division likely to lead to mutual recriminations and bad feelings?

A. If the two parties work their respective programmes without interfering with one another, as I hope and trust they will, there should be no room for mutual recrimination and bad feeling. Each party has full and free scope to develop on its own lines by following the particular method of work which appeals to it. Both have a common goal and both have to fight their way to it with the weapon of non-violent non-cooperation. The difference lies in the three essentials: time, place and manner of using the same weapon. The programme approved by the Gaya Congress leaves these essentials undetermined and is to

<sup>1</sup>The Bombay Chronicle, 10 January 1923.

<sup>2</sup>The Leader, 20 January 1923.

<sup>3</sup>Young India, an English weekly founded by Jinnadas Dwarkadas and others at Bombay in 1915; published as bi-weekly under Mahatma Gandhi's supervision from 7 May to 4 October 1919, from 8 October 1919, issued as weekly from Ahmedabad with Mahatma Gandhi as editor.

my mind nothing more than a botchpotch of pious wishes with a few vague threats of terrible things to follow thrown in to season the dish for the acceptance of the more impatient non-cooperator. When, where and how these terrible things will happen no one knows. We, on the other hand, mean to take practical steps and go forward with a definite objective marking each stage of the onward march. The very nature of the difference between the two programmes, wide as it is, easily admits of their being so adjusted as to avoid conflicting propaganda. If each party goes about its own business in the right spirit a time will soon come for them to join their forces. They owe it to the cause as well as to one another to see that there is no conflict of propaganda.

*Q.* I am afraid they have not made a good beginning that way. Are you aware that some of the accredited organs of the no-change party have already ascribed unworthy motive to you and Mr. Das and applied choice epithets such as waifs and strays of politics to members of your party?

*A.* Yes—but you may be sure that neither Mr. Das nor I will take any notice of personal attacks. As for the choice epithets you mention those who use them unwittingly pay the compliment to themselves as our party is mostly drawn from the present All-India Committee and the existing provincial and district committees. But I was forgetting. We are in one sense a discreditable lot as I am told that political ex-convicts have swarmed into our party, and these may well be described as 'waifs and strays of politics'.

*Q.* But how can conflicting propaganda be avoided when there is conflict between important items of the two programmes and in some respects one is the direct negative of the other?

*A.* It does look like a paradox but there need be no real conflict in working the two side by side. I hope this will be made clear in the detailed programme we are about to issue. Meanwhile, I can only give you my own ideas for what they are worth. Let us take the more important items you have in mind. First there are the Council elections. Our friends are going to tell the voter to abstain from going to the poll. They may not tell him to vote for the Moderate in preference to the non-cooperator. If we decide to stand for election it will only be necessary to supplement this excellent advice by telling the voter that if he by any chance finds himself at the poll he is to vote for N.C.O. and not the Moderate. The worst that can happen is that he will not accept the advice of either party and if this is repeated in a large number of cases it will be evident that the N.C.O. movement has not made sufficient headway with those who enjoy the franchise. If this is the fact the sooner it is known the better. The failure attending each vote recorded for a Moderate will have to be shared by both the Congress parties, by the one for the reason that it could not stop the voter from going to the poll and by the other for the reason that it could not get him to vote for its nominee. So that if we fail, we shall be in good company. But I have said this on the assumption that both parties will carry on an intensive propaganda among the voters and will actually come in touch with a great majority of them. This however will not happen in practice. Judging from past experience and the general nature of their propaganda our friends will hold mass meetings and return home thoroughly satisfied by a show of some thousands of hands ninety per cent of the owners of which will be neither



voters nor taxpayers. We shall, however, confine ourselves as much as possible to the voters and the chances are that we shall succeed in inducing a very large number of them to accept our nominees. Next take the boycott of British goods against which so many pious reasons have been urged. Is it conceivable that our friends will carry on an active propaganda in favour of British goods? If not, there is no fear of conflict. Lastly, take the municipal and district boards. Dr. Ansari and Mr. Rajagopalachari, after agreeing to the unanimous recommendation of the C.D. Committee favouring entry into these bodies, thought it fit to oppose a resolution framed in identical terms and referred to the Gaya Congress by the All-India Committee. It is said that the opposition was merely a device for catching votes against Council elections by getting rid of the inconsistency of exhibiting holy horror at the cooperation involved in standing for the latter when precisely the same kind of cooperation was commended in the matter of municipal and district board elections. We know that many a stout N.C.O. of the purely spiritual cast has entered these bodies and many another of the same type is striving to do so. We know also that Mahatma Gandhi so far from being opposed to the capture of these bodies has written and spoken approvingly of the doings of the N.C.O. members in them. In these circumstances it is not easy to imagine how any conflict can arise on this head.

*Q.* But what about the civil disobedience resolution by which the Congress has undertaken to raise 25 lakhs of rupees and 50,000 volunteers? Are the two parties going to work it together?

*A.* I hope not. Speaking for myself and without meaning any offence the resolution is suggestive of the exploits of the immortal knight of windmill fame. It lacks the three essentials (definiteness of time, place and manner) I have just mentioned. We are not told how this one army of 50,000 volunteers is going to be trained in the art of civil disobedience and what it is expected to do when the training is completed. That it will have an adventurous career is likely enough but more than this it is impossible to guess at the present moment. I do not believe in a course of schooling to prepare people for civil disobedience. It can only come when the general atmosphere is sufficiently charged for a spontaneous combustion. *Khaddar* alone will not guarantee strong enough current for this and there is little else in the Gaya Programme calculated to do so. You cannot prepare martyrs in cold blood by making average citizens sign a pledge of martyrdom and spending lakhs of rupees on them. The idea is too ridiculous to be seriously considered and is obviously a clumsy compromise between the patient worshippers of *khaddar* as a panacea and the impatient votaries of civil disobedience. The latter seemed to have a hazy notion of following on the lines of the Ahmedabad resolution, forgetting that the organisation of volunteers under that resolution was by itself an act of civil disobedience intended to be the nation's answer to the attack made by the Government on the primary right of association. Pointed attention was drawn to this fact by the U.P. delegates who brought in an amendment at the open session of the Congress inviting other provinces to send their quota of volunteers to the U.P. and Assam where the Criminal Law Amendment Act was then in force. The Congress however refused to come up to the scratch and the Working Committee has now specially

exempted the provinces in which the Act is still in force from contributing their quota of volunteers. So the 50,000 volunteers are simply meant to prepare themselves to respond to some future call on their patriotism which the Working Committee may make. I for one will not move my little finger to enlist a single volunteer or to collect a single rupee for preparing for C.D. until I know what is the nature of the civil disobedience contemplated and how it is expected to force the hands of the Government. If my party adopts this view no action will be taken by it on this resolution and there will be no conflict.

*Q* Will it be open to your party to refuse to carry out the Congress resolution while it remains within the Congress?

*A.* There is no duty laid on Congressmen to carry out every resolution of the Congress whether they believe in it or not. This is admitted on all hands.

*Q* I suppose your party also has some sort of civil disobedience in view?

*A* Here again I can only give you my own view. I look upon civil disobedience as the last weapon of the N.C.O. but in the first place it is a two-edged weapon to be used very carefully and only at a last resort and secondly, it cannot be made to order. To be perfectly frank I have no faith in general mass civil disobedience of the type Mahatmaji wanted to bring about in Bardoli and Mahatmaji knows it. The only possible kind I can conceive of is what is known as collective individual C.D. on a large scale and the only way to bring it about is to raise definite issues between the people and the Government time after time and to put the Government in the wrong every time. The ever increasing volume of right on one side and of wrong on the other will sooner or later automatically create the requisite atmosphere and when the psychological moment arrives you will find yourself in the thick of C.D. without any previous notice. This of course presupposes that your people have meanwhile developed enough power of resistance against the physical might of the Government on the one hand and the temptation to violence on the other. The unanimous report of the C.D. Committee adopted by the All-India Committee and allowed to pass unchallenged by the Gaya Congress shows that the people have not yet acquired that power of resistance. It is idle to think of C.D. without it or to create it by simply enlisting volunteers and collecting money.

*Q.* Will not the kind of C.D. you contemplate take a long time to materialize? Mr. C.R. Das seems to think that an immediate occasion for it might arise out of the Near East complications and that the Congress Resolution is too weak to provide for it?

*A.* You are referring to what Mr. Das said in his resignation. He explained what he meant by it at Benares the other day and his explanation fully supports my view. I have fixed no time limit for the actual starting of C.D. I say that the determining factors are (1) the nature and gravity of the issues raised between the people and the Government; (2) the public feeling behind the issue which is the chief source of the power of resistance I have spoken of and (3) the fact that the Government has put itself in the wrong. A combination of these may occur within a few weeks or it may take years to come about. The Khilafat raises very big and grave issues directly affecting millions of Indians, there is strong public feeling behind it, and the British Cabinet has repeatedly

A The Presidential address of Mr. C.R. Das should be a sufficient answer to this. We yield to none in our respect for Mahatma Gandhi but are certainly not prepared to follow blindfold every passage of his speeches or articles in *Young India*. We do not claim to be emissaries of God sent to this wicked world to purge it of sin but offer our services to the country as human beings to secure human rights by every legitimate and peaceful human effort at all costs and sacrifices. This is the sum total of our religion, philosophy, spirituality and politics in the Congress.

#### 246. Reclamation of Malkanas, 6 April 1923<sup>1</sup>

My attention has been drawn to an article contributed to the daily *Khilafat*<sup>2</sup> of Bombay by Maulana Abdul Majid Sahib in which he quotes a statement attributed to me in the *Hamdam* of Lucknow of the 20th March to the effect that I look upon the movement to bring Malkana Rajputs within the fold of Hinduism with contempt: '*nafrat ki nigah se dekhate hain*'. I have not had an opportunity of seeing the *Hamdam*, but it is not a fact that I made any statement of the kind attributed to me. On the contrary I have clearly said in my recent public speeches that I viewed the movement as a perfectly legitimate one which every Hindu who believes in *shuddhi* has an undoubted right to carry on peacefully and without causing insult or annoyance to the Mussalmans or deprecating Islam. I have also said that I would have been glad if the movement had not been started at this juncture when feelings are strained between Hindus and Mussalmans in the Punjab. But I have never disputed the right of the Hindus to choose their own time, however much I may regret the consequences which are mainly due to improper comments both in the Hindu and Mussalman press.

#### 247. Political Offences and Non-cooperators<sup>3</sup>

I can only answer this question off-hand without in any way committing my party. It is immaterial to us what Government will do. We are thoroughly prepared for every possible contingency. Personally, I should be glad if Government arm themselves with fresh forged weapons to disqualify every non-cooperator from contesting the elections. We are out for fight and do not rely on any help from the inimical bureaucracy. Many of our best men are disqualified under the existing rules. It is open to Government either to enforce these rules strictly or to remove disqualifications. In the latter case, the issues will be very simple. We shall immediately proceed on to achieve the ends we are aiming at by council-entry. In the former case even the issues will be simple enough. The immediate removal of the slur of disqualifi-

<sup>1</sup>The Leader, 8 April 1923.

<sup>2</sup>Khilafat was started in Urdu from Bombay, 1921; Kutubuddin Siddiqi was its editor.

<sup>3</sup>The Tribune, 16 May 1923, in reply to a query whether the bar against non-cooperators, who had been sentenced to more than six months, was going to be enforced during the coming election to the Councils, Pandit Nehru replied to the above effect.

will accept my sincere apologies. My disappointment is greater than theirs as I feel that I owe it to my fellow-workers and the public at large to indicate clearly the views I hold on the more important questions which are agitating the country and the means which in my humble judgement should be adopted to deal with the situation confronting us. But in the circumstances I can offer those whom I cannot have the privilege to meet and address, no better substitute than the reports of my speeches in the press which, I trust, will extend its usual hospitality to me. But whether I have the good fortune to meet them in their towns or not, I hope to see delegates from far and near muster strong at Delhi to uphold the reputation of the Congress as the only great national institution truly representative of the entire country.

#### 249. *Employment in Japan*<sup>1</sup>

Numerous applications have been made to me for employment in Japan in the various departments of the Administration. I desire it to be widely known that I have nothing whatever to do with Japan or recruitment to the public services in that country. So far as I am aware Japan does not stand in need of outside help in running any of its public departments. Persons desiring employment in Japan will do well to approach the Japan consulate and cease writing to me.

#### 250. *The Swarajist Programme, 28 December 1923*<sup>2</sup>

It was suggested that the conference should be held at Delhi two or three days before the first meeting of the Assembly in order to avoid a double journey by members. This request is based on a misapprehension of the objects of the conference and the steps proposed to be taken thereafter. It is, therefore, necessary to explain carefully the programme which has to be gone through before 13th January, the date of the first meeting of the Assembly. A meeting of the General Council of the party will be held at Cocanada on the 29th December to formulate the demand on behalf of the party to be presented to the Government and to frame general instructions to be followed by the Swarajists in the Assembly and the provincial Councils. A small committee will also be appointed at this meeting to confer with non-Swarajist elected members of the Assembly and the provincial Councils with full powers to amend the demand and the instructions in accordance with such agreement as may be arrived at between the Swarajist and other nationalist members. This is to avoid the necessity of calling another meeting of the General Council of the Swarajya Party should it be found necessary to amend the demand and instructions framed at Cocanada in any particular not affecting the settled principles and policy of Swarajya Party. The demand, as adopted by the General Council, will at once be published for general information. The conference at

<sup>1</sup>The Leader, 28 November 1923.

<sup>2</sup>The Leader, 31 December 1923.

Allahabad of all elected members of the Legislative Assembly and representatives of the elected members of provincial Councils will be to consider the demand formulated at Cocanada and explore the avenues of joint action by all Nationalists. The demand, as finally settled at this conference, will be signed by the members present agreeing thereto and will then be circulated to all other elected members of the Assembly and the various provincial Councils for their signatures if they wish to join. It will take at least ten days to have the replies of absent members. It is proposed, subject to any resolution of the conference on the subject, to submit the demand to the Governor-General on or about the 15th January after it is signed by as many members of the Assembly and the provincial Councils as possible. It will be obvious that a demand, as numerously signed as possible by elected members of all the Legislatures in the country, will have far greater weight than any resolution passed at a meeting of the elected members of the Assembly only. After such a demand is presented it will of course be for members of the Assembly to take such action thereon as may be advised and a meeting of the latter will be held in Delhi about the 25th January to consider such action. Having regard to the fact that the conference at Allahabad is expected to be attended by elected members of the Assembly and the provincial Councils and the further fact that the latter will have to meet thereafter and settle the line of action to be followed, which should as far as possible be uniform in all the provinces, the date fixed is the latest possible viz., the 7th January.

### 251. *Views on Cocanada Congress*<sup>1</sup>

Asked as to his impressions of the Thirty-eighth session of the Indian National Congress, Panditji said:

"My impression of the Cocanada Congress is that it has been both a success and a failure—success in having taken a step forward in removing some of the misunderstandings prevailing among the leaders, and in creating a desire for mutual co-operation on both sides in the future—and failure in so far as some of the budding leaders are concerned. Their disappointment in not attaining the full bloom [stature?] of leaders has in my opinion sown fresh seeds of discontent in the minds of such following as they have been able to muster. On the whole however the Cocanada Congress will, I trust, make for general goodwill among the workers."

"We had", continued Panditji, "held several conferences at the instance of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and Hakim Ajmal Khan to devise means for a complete overhaul of the Congress programme and to concentrate our attention on the actual work before us. To my disappointment these matters were not discussed either in the Subjects Committee or in the open Congress and it now rests with the Working Committee to introduce such reforms in this direction as it can within its limited powers."

As to the nature of the reforms mooted by the leaders, Panditji observed: "The need of the hour was to reorganise the Congress. Myself and some of us were of opinion that a competent permanent staff should be attached to

<sup>1</sup>Forw ard, 5 January 1924.

such department of work and specific portfolios assigned to the different members of the Working Committee. Special measures were also necessary to restore Hindu-Moslem unity and these would have carried great weight by being initiated by the Congress and then adopted by the Working Committee. The constitution of the Working Committee itself cannot be said to be entirely satisfactory as all shades of opinion in the Congress are not adequately represented in it. It all depends upon the spirit in which the work is done and I hope and trust that those at the helm of affairs will not do anything that tends to cause disagreement. The Congress resolutions have no doubt made it possible for all to work together, if they are only minded to do so."

*Q.* How was it, Panditji, that your Resolution on the Bengal Draft of the Hindu-Moslem Pact was thrown out? What led the delegates to oppose your Resolution?

Panditji: The Resolution as moved by me was a most harmless one and in my opinion the opposition set up was wholly senseless. The manner in which the Bengal Draft was reported in certain papers was very misleading, and I confess that I was myself under a wrong impression until I met Mr. C.R. Das and heard from him what was actually done in Bengal. There should, however, have been no misunderstanding about it in the Congress after the very clear explanation given by Mr. Das. The Congress was not being committed to any view by my Resolution which merely asked the Committee appointed by the Congress to consider the Bengal Draft and make its own report on the subject. If I had known that the mere mention of the Bengal Draft would evoke so much opposition I would have avoided it and the omission would have made no difference whatever to my Resolution. But no objection was taken in the Subjects Committee to the form of my Resolution and I remained under the impression that it would be passed by the Congress *nem con*. But when the amendment was moved in the open Congress it was too late to consent to it as I thought by doing so I would unnecessarily hurt the feelings of the Mahomedans. As it is, the deletion of the Bengal Draft from the Resolution has not made the slightest difference, as all that the Resolution required was that the Committee should consider it and there is nothing to prevent its doing so even now. In my opinion the delegates were so prejudiced by the misinterpretations of the Bengal Draft Pact that they refused even to refer it to the Committee. This prejudice is bound to wear out in course of time and the Bengal Draft will be taken at its true worth, viz., that of a proposal from one Provincial Committee to be considered along with other proposals on the same subject.

*Q.* Don't you think, Sir, that considering the condition of Bengal the Draft was a fair and equitable one?

Panditji: I don't know of any special feature of the Hindu-Moslem problem in Bengal except that there is a preponderance of the Mahomedan population. But the same is the case in the Punjab. In provinces where the Mahomedans are in a very small minority, they will not, I am afraid, accept the principles laid down in Bengal on the basis of population. Take for instance the U.P. where the Mahomedans do not form more than 14 per cent of the total population. In Municipalities and District Boards they have already been allowed representation in excess of their numbers, and they are not likely to give up

what they have already secured. The principle adopted in Bengal is therefore not applicable to the whole country. Besides, I am of opinion that these things cannot be decided on principles but depend entirely on the consent of the parties concerned. I shall have no hesitation to support a pact arrived at with such consent, however illogical it may be. But we find considerable difficulty in advocating a proposal merely on the ground of its reasonableness apart from the wishes of the majority of the people concerned. There is no logical or other scientific test that you can apply to these things. I am therefore unable at the present stage to pronounce any opinion as to the fairness or otherwise of the Bengal Draft Pact.

*252. Comment on Interview with Mahatma Gandhi, 27 February 1924<sup>1</sup>*

I had a private consultation with Mr. Gandhi and cannot be expected to disclose what happened. I may state, however, that the policy of the Swarajya Party remains unchanged after that consultation. As for the policy of the Nationalist Party which includes the Swarajya Party for certain purposes, it will continue to be governed by the constitution of that Party adopted at a general meeting of the members held in Delhi the other day.

*253. Nationalisation of Steel Industry, 20 May 1924<sup>2</sup>*

Questioned regarding the forecast by a Bombay newspaper on the Gandhi-Swarajist conference now going on at Juhu, Pandit Motilal Nehru replied, "I must commend the journalistic enterprise of the paper, but all such enterprises are attended with risks not the least of which is the liability to overshoot the mark. In this instance, however, the forecast by the paper goes far beyond and indulges in what are known as terminological inexactitudes. The flaring headlines and the opening part of the story purporting to be a quotation from Mr. Gandhi are pure inventions. The only truth is that Mr. Gandhi has given us a statement of his views in writing and we are considering it. Beyond this I am not at present free to make any communication to the press but I may say that both Mr. Gandhi's and our statements will be simultaneously handed over to the Associated Press for publication either tomorrow or the day after. The delay is partly due to the fact that Monday was a day of silence with Mr. Gandhi".

On his attention being drawn to a statement by Lala Lajpat Rai, as reported in a special cable to another Bombay paper, wherein the Lala says that Mr. Gandhi will shortly issue a manifesto against Council-entry by Congressmen, Pandit Nehru said, "I do not know what particular document Lalaji is referring to as Mr. Gandhi's forthcoming manifesto because the statement I have referred to above was not ready till the day before yesterday. He is probably referring to some earlier communication from Mr. Gandhi in which he had expressed the view already published in the *Young India* to the effect that

<sup>1</sup>Forward, 28 February 1924.

<sup>2</sup>The Leader, 22 May 1924.

he saw no reason to alter his original programme which, as we all know, is opposed to entry into provincial Councils or the Legislative Assembly. That Mr. Gandhi does not believe in entering these bodies is an open secret known to the man in the street and Lalaji has said nothing further."

### TARIFF BOARD'S REPORT

To a question as to what he thought of the Indian Tariff Board's report, Pandit Motilal Nehru said, "It is well-known that the Indian National Congress has been committed to a protectionist policy for years past, and Mr. Gandhi has recently declared himself to be a protectionist in no uncertain terms. My views are substantially the same as Mr. Gandhi's. The only questions we have to consider are, (1) whether the protection proposed is adequate, and (2) whether it is necessary to safeguard the interests of labour and those of the consumer by supplementary provisions. These questions are now receiving our attention."

Referring to Mr. V.J. Patel's interview where Mr. Patel had expressed the opinion that the Indian steel industry should be nationalised Pandit Motilal Nehru was asked if Mr. Patel's view correctly represented the general opinion of the Swarajya Party.

Panditji replied:—"I cannot say. I take it that Mr. Patel has expressed his individual views. They have not been discussed at our party meeting and until this is done it is impossible to say what support those views are likely to get. Speaking for myself I entirely disagree with the main proposal which Mr. Patel has put in the alternative form. He says either nationalise the steel industry or give it full protection subject to the condition that in case the company make a profit in excess of 5 per cent, it is to go to the Government." "I should have thought", continued Pandit Motilal, "that before you talk of nationalising any industry you have to nationalise the Government itself. There is little difference between running an industry through a foreign Government and handing it over to a foreign company. In either case the bulk of the profits goes out of the country. We know that the so-called nationalisation of railways is not an unmixed blessing. As for the alternative suggestion it does not seem to me to be a business proposition and I cannot see how the arrangement is to be carried into effect. One part of it comes within the province of the legislature and the other is a matter of contract between the company and the Government. We are yet very far away from legislation of a socialist nature which the suggestion implies."

As the interviewer was taking leave of Pandit Nehru the latter stopped him and said:—

"I just wish to refer to something about another matter in connection with the Tariff Bill which will perhaps interest the public. There is, I am told, a persistent rumour in some quarters that Tatas have given a large sum of money, variously estimated from 2 to 3 lacs, to the Swarajya Party with a view to gain their support to the Tariff Board's report in the Assembly. I wish they had done so but to my utter disappointment they are far too shrewd to pay for what they know is coming to them as a free gift. Holding the views we are known to hold I do not see how we could oppose protection to a premier



industry. As a matter of fact we have not yet raised a penny in Bombay nor have we appealed to any section of the public for subscription to our party funds, but are shortly going to do so. The rumour I have referred to will not in the least affect that appeal and Tatas will be among the first to be publicly invited to contribute to our funds and I trust no silly rumours will come in the way of a generous response from any of the commercial magnates of Bombay if they agree in the economic programme we are going to adopt. It is evident that political parties subsist entirely on subscriptions from the public for whose sole benefit they exist. It would be absurd for us to hesitate to approach any section of the public on the ground that it is likely to benefit by our activities."

*254. Comment on Mahatma Gandhi's Statement, 5 June 1924<sup>1</sup>*

Asked if he had any statement to make on Mr. Gandhi's last declaration, Pandit Motilal Nehru said:

"I have nothing to add to the statement already issued to the press over the signatures of Mr. C.R. Das and myself, but wish to take the opportunity you have given me to say that I have as profound a respect for Mahatma Gandhi and his opinions as any of those with whom his word is final. If I differed from him on certain points it was not only on the most careful consideration of his opinions, but after the closest self-examination to make sure that I was not allowing prejudice for pre-conceived opinions to usurp the place of reason. I have fully and freely criticised his opinions in the course of my conversation with him. He has listened to my criticism with the utmost consideration and replied to it in the calm and courteous manner, all his own. I look upon it as my misfortune and not his fault that I remain unconvinced, and so long as I am not convinced my duty is to work my own programme for all it is worth."

### IF SWARAJISTS WITHDREW

*Q.* Are you going to advise your party to submit to Mr. Gandhi's suggestion that they must stand out of the Congress executive?

*A.* I would not be true to myself if I did [so. Such of the Swarajists as are in the executive, have been elected by their respective constituencies and so long as they continue to enjoy the confidence of those constituencies, I see no reason why they should stand out, and not exercise such influence on the Congress organisation as they already possess. Take for instance Bengal, where the executive is almost entirely Swarajist. The Swarajists' view must be taken to be the popular view in Bengal, and on Mahatma Gandhi's own reasoning the no-changers in that province have no right to control the organisation. But even where the Swarajists are in a minority, I don't see why they should retire from the field and lose the opportunity of popularising their views within the councils of the Congress. If it is permissible to all Congressmen to influence Congress policy I do not see why this should be done only from outside as de-

<sup>1</sup>*The Leader*, 7 June 1924.

legates. When the Swarajists make up their minds to do anything they are employing all legitimate means to attain the end from all possible directions open to them. This, indeed, is the basic principle upon which the policy of Council-entry is based. The analogy of a Government carried jointly by two parties with opposite views, is not at all applicable to the Congress constitution under which every executive office is open to election. If Mahatmaji wishes to introduce Cabinet system, he will have to get the Congress to change the constitution. I may, however, be permitted to say that if he does so he will inevitably convert the Congress into a one man's show, a result which he is trying to avoid. It is well-known that the only persons who dare to raise their voice against Mahatmaji's in private consultations and occasionally succeeded in inducing him to alter his views are now ranged on the side of the Swarajists. Without them the Congress organisations would only consist of orthodox followers of Mahatmaji to whom his word is the law of God. I need hardly dwell on the consequences.

### TRUTHFULNESS IN CONGRESS POLITICS

The representative drew Pandit Motilal's attention to the advice of Mahatma Gandhi that those who did not believe in all the five boycotts and also non-violence and truthfulness should resign from the Congress executive.

Asked as to what Mr. Gandhi could have meant by 'truthfulness' Pandit Motilal said: "Truth has been waiting for a definition since the days of Pontius Pilate<sup>1</sup> Mahatmaji has his own conception of it and I have mine. It is impossible for me to tell you exactly what he means, but he probably refers to some kind of mental attitude which is not always referable to speech or action. I do not take the word 'truthfulness' to have been used by Mahatmaji with special reference to Swarajists. He has evidently come to believe that there is lack of truthfulness, according to his conception of it, in Congress circles generally. I think Mahatmaji will do well to point out to those who agree with him in all matters that, apart from the mental attitude, there is such a thing as acting a lie. As for the Swarajists, they may be left to take care of their own morals."

### DIFFERENCES

*Q.* Will you now explain the nature of the differences which have arisen? Don't you think they constitute a split in the Congress.

*A.* I agree with Mahatmaji that there need not necessarily be a split in the sense of a break-up of the Congress. Differ as I do from him on certain points I have full confidence in the unifying influence he has with all classes and I have no reason to doubt that he will make full use of it.

*Q.* What, in your opinion, is the effect that is likely to be produced in the country and on the Government in particular by the admitted differences in the Congress?

<sup>1</sup>Pontius Pilate, b. 1st century A.D.; Roman Governor in Judaea; Procurator of Judaea under Emperor Tiberius; fearing Jewish religious and popular recrimination, ordered execution of Jesus; traditionally committed suicide in Rome.

A. There will, of course, be jubilation in official circles, but I hope it will be short-lived. If the Swarajists will only hold together and do their duty they will continue to enjoy the confidence of their constituencies, which is the one thing that matters more than any other. Besides I have not ceased to hope that Mahatmaji will sooner or later feel called upon to give them his moral support. But whether that is forthcoming or not we the Swarajists have made up our minds to stand on our own legs. In any case, I have no doubt whatever that as between the Government and the Swarajists, the people will wholeheartedly support the latter. Mahatmaji says that those who are responsible for the conduct of the Government of India are not fools and that they are clever and wide awake. I quite agree and that is the reason why I think that the Government's first care will be to placate the Swarajists if they at all dread civil disobedience which we have all in contemplation.

255. 'Homage' to Gopinath Saha, 10 June 1924<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru, interviewed about the much discussed Serajgunj resolution about Gopinath Saha,<sup>2</sup> murderer of Mr. Earnest Day,<sup>3</sup> said:

"It is clear to me that this is nothing but an Anglo-Indian stunt got up to prejudice the Swarajists. The storm raised by the Anglo-Indian press and the die-hards in Parliament over the Serajgunj resolution, if I may borrow Professor Richard's expression used in another connection in a recent cable, is not even a decent storm in a tea cup. What strikes me as very peculiar is that while the storm is being assiduously lashed into fury both in India and in England, the exact terms of the 'abominable' resolution have not been published in newspapers that I have read so far. That makes me think that there is something seriously wrong somewhere outside the Serajgunj Conference and with some person or persons other than Mr. C.R. Das. I am so sure of this that I have not even taken the trouble to wire to Mr. Das for the real facts".

Asked whether he believed that a resolution on the lines published in the press had been passed, Pandit Motilal said, "I do believe that a resolution referring to the murder of Mr. Day by Gopinath Saha and the motive that actuated him to commit the crime has been passed. Beyond this I believe nothing and certainly not the story of homage as it has been related. I happen to know that no single individual in India has worked so hard or spent his money so lavishly as Mr. Das has done to win the anarchists in his province from their misguided activities and I cannot believe that he now puts his seal of approval upon so heinous a crime as Gopinath Saha's. The most that probably happened was an expression of opinion somewhat on the lines of Mahatma Gandhi's in his recent press interview. Mahatmaji has felt admiration for the self-reliance, the defiance of death and the love of the country of his anarchist friend whom he calls a misleading patriot. I expect the Serajgunj

resolution to be as innocuous as Mahatmaji's appreciation of the anarchist's misleading patriotism. *If the homage refers to the immediate motive, I do not agree because it was nothing but a mad impulse to get rid of an innocent man in mistake for another who was supposed to have done something detrimental to the interests of the country. I do not call it patriotic, though I quite admit that at the bottom of it there is always an intense patriotism. My view is that anarchists unlike poets are not born but made by the Government under which they live. The Indian anarchist is undoubtedly a handiwork of the bureaucracy but a disease is no less a disease because it has been caused by the bad climate in which the patient is compelled to live. No one appreciates this more than Mr. C.R. Das and if he had anything to do with the drafting of the resolution I will expect a master of language and of phrasing like him to make it perfectly clear.*"

Pandit Motilal next referred to Mahatma Gandhi's declaration that he would attempt to convert the anarchists to the doctrine of non-violence. The Pandit said, "While I entirely agree with the ethics of Mahatmaji I am afraid that it offers no practical solution. Violence and non-violence must continue to exist side by side so long as human nature is what it is. Mahatmaji will no doubt be able to convert those anarchists who are not yet quite confirmed in the belief that theirs is the only method to get rid of the foreign Government. It is true that the anarchical movement in Bengal came to a sudden halt when the campaign of non-violent non-cooperation was first started but while the movement captured the imagination of the country the anarchist merely stood apart in a doubting mood and never lost faith in his own methods. It was made quite clear to Mahatmaji and those who worked with him that the anarchist was merely marking time."

Asked as to how he would stamp out anarchism, Panditji said, "The Swarajists are combating anarchism in a more direct manner and have invited the Government to employ the remedy which attacks the very root of the disease. This remedy is the immediate grant to India of the right to govern herself. It is for this purpose that they have entered the Councils and even offered their cooperation if the Government would take the right course. The future of anarchism in India, therefore, lies in the hands of the Government alone."

#### *256. Statement on Bengal Ordinance, 30 October 1924<sup>1</sup>*

My view is that the Government has gone mad—stark mad. The attitude of the Swarajya Party is that it will firmly adhere to its principles and policy whatever the Government might do but it is not merely a question of principles and policy of the Swarajya Party alone. The new Ordinance<sup>2</sup> is clearly

<sup>1</sup>Forward, 1 November 1924.

<sup>2</sup>Bengal Ordinance, 1924; the Government of Bengal, on 25 October 1924, with the sanction of the Governor-General promulgated an Ordinance to check the forces of the growing revolutionary movement in Bengal. Under this Ordinance and Regulation III of 1818 several arrests were made including those of a few Swarajists.

generally accepted and during the years 1920 and 1921 they were content to stand by and watch the events whilst using any form of organisation in order to extend their influence with a view to future action." Here His Lordship gives a complete answer to the elaptrap about conspiracy being "effectively crushed" by the use of Reg. III of 1818 and other repressive measures. It was really the advent of non-violent non-co-operation, the general acceptance of which in the country forced the anarchists to call a halt and to "stand by and watch events." But what were the events that followed is a vigorous campaign by the Government against non-violent non-co-operation itself, against its best friend and the worst enemy of its enemy. What was more natural than the revival of anarchical crime after this. I am obliged to Lord Lytton for his support, if unconscious, of what I said in the course of the debate on the repeal of Criminal Law Amendment Act (1908) and may be excused for quoting from my own speech as I am doing so simply to prove that His Lordship is perfectly right in diagnosing the true cause of suspension of anarchical crime during the years 1921 and 1922. I said, "I know how a wave of anarchy arose. I have watched the ebb and flow of the wave. You may pride yourself in the belief that it was your repressive laws that put down anarchy in Bengal for a time. Nothing can be further from truth. What actually happened was that Mahatma Gandhi came in with his non-violent non-co-operation and put an effective stop to all anarchical crimes for the time being. It is you who crippled him. It is you who deprived him of the opportunities he possessed and you must take the consequence. These conspiracies must revive in the ordinary course of things and you cannot expect otherwise." It is thus clear that Lord Lytton and I are at one as to the true reason why there was no revolutionary crime. For the best part of the three years following the advent of non-violent non-co-operation his Lordship must be credited with knowledge of connection between the cause and effect and I flatter myself with the belief that if he had found it convenient to discuss the effect of Government campaign against non-violent non-co-operation he would have arrived at precisely the conclusion I have summarised in the last three sentences of the quotation I have made from my speech.

### PROFESSION AND ACTION

The most remarkable fact is that the statements of both the Lords Reading and Lytton, fully recognise the existence of perfectly legitimate political organisations side by side with secret revolutionary societies and while both protest strongly against any intention to interfere with the former, we find the names of prominent Swarajists among the very first victims of the new Ordinance. The India Office has assured us that "the Ordinance is not aimed at the Swarajist movement or any legitimate activities of the members of that movement" and yet the very first round-up includes almost all active Swarajist workers in Calcutta and deprives the leader of that movement of the assistance of all those who were actually engaged in carrying out the work of the party. The foundation for the arrest of Mr. Das himself is well and truly laid in the statement of Lord Lytton and if Mr. Das is to enjoy temporary freedom His Lordship is not obviously to blame for it. Perhaps the very awkward fact

which could not be got over, was that the arrest of Mr. Das would destroy the last shred of the pretence that Ordinance is not directed against the Swarajya Party.

### MR. SUBHAS BOSE

I am not well acquainted with many of those who have been arrested but have had the privilege of knowing Mr Subhas Chandra Bose for sometime past and can say with confidence that he is as much connected with secret and revolutionary societies and their methods as Lord Lytton himself is. He is a gentleman of great culture and an ex-member of the Indian Civil Service. He threw up the I.C.S. in utter disgust of the system of Government which as a member of that Service he would have to carry on. He had been present at numerous consultations in which I took part and it has always been a pleasure to listen to his views.

### MOVE AGAINST ALL POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Apart from the direct blow the new Ordinance deals to all political activities distasteful to the Government, I take it to be a contemptuous defiance of the action taken by the elected representatives of the people at the Simla session of the Assembly in repealing the Criminal Law Amendment Act 1908 part 2, the remnant of the Rowlatt Act of sad memory. The motion that a repealing bill be taken into consideration was adopted by the Assembly by 71 votes to 39 after which the Government had not the courage to challenge a division on the third reading. Among those who voted with the majority were Maulvi Abul Kasim,<sup>1</sup> Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer, Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan<sup>2</sup>, Khan Bahadur Ghulam Bari<sup>3</sup>, Dr. L.K. Hyder<sup>4</sup>, Sir Purshottamdas, Diwan Bahadur Ramchandra Rao, Khan Bahadur Rajan Baksh Shah<sup>5</sup>, Diwan Bahadur T. Ran-

<sup>1</sup>Maulvi Abul Kasim, b. 1872; belonged to an aristocratic Muslim family of Burdwan; zamindar; journalist, after graduation became private secretary to his uncle Abdul Jabbar Sahib, Dewan of Bhopal State; resigned to participate in the swadeshi movement; Editor, *Musulman*, Secretary, Bengal Muhammadan Association, 1906, member, Bengal Legislative Council under Morley-Minto Reforms, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1921-26, Bengal Legislative Council, 1927-36; d. 1936.

<sup>2</sup>Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan, b. 1895; educated at Punjab University; member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1924-30; joined Jinnah's Independent Party; Minister, Alwar State, 1928; member, Council of State, 1935-36, Punjab Legislative Assembly, 1937-45; Minister for Health in the Interim Government, 1946; Minister for Food, Agriculture and Health, Pakistan, 1947; Ambassador to Iran, 1948-52, Turkey, 1952-53, High Commissioner to India, 1953-56; Ambassador to Italy, 1956-57, d. 1963.

<sup>3</sup>Khan Bahadur Ghulam Bari; represented West Central Punjab Muhammadan constituency in the Indian Legislative Assembly, 1924-26.

<sup>4</sup>Dr L.K. Hyder; b. 1888; member, Public Service Commission; Professor of Economics, Aligarh University; member, Taxation Enquiry Committee, 1924-25, Banking Enquiry Committee, 1930-31; delegate to League of Nations, 1931; d. 1953.

<sup>5</sup>Makhdum Sayed Rajan Baksh Shah Jilani; b. 1877; descendent of an ancient Persian family of South-West Punjab; served the Multan Municipality for thirty years, President, Multan Municipal Committee, 1921; member, Punjab Legislative Council, 1917-20, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1921-36; d. 1936.

gachanar and Sir Chimanlal Setalvad who cannot be accused of any predilection for anarchical crime. The Government has now given its reply to this crushing defeat by reviving the repealed part of the Rowlatt Act in a worse form. Will the Assembly pocket the insult lying down?

### THE PARTY'S POSITION

The position of the Swarajya Party is clear and strong. It accepts the challenge thrown out by the Government and defies it to do its worst. It will fight the reactionary forces in India and England to the bitter end. Ordinances and regulations have no terrors for it, jail and gallows are far more acceptable to it than the humiliation of living under the autocratic rule of an irresponsible bureaucracy. It has openly put an honest programme of thoroughly constitutional campaign against the bureaucracy before the Indian and British public and it means to push it through at all cost. The Swarajya Party stands, to-day, face to face with the bureaucracy determined to give battle to it on its own ground. At every point where it comes into conflict with the rights of the people while no threats will cow it down, no provocation will drive it to violence of any kind. Self-sacrifice is the only weapon it will use and with this weapon it will fight to the last man. Let Government make no mistake about its numbers. United India stands behind it. Communal and political differences notwithstanding—we may break each other's heads and quarrel among ourselves on communal rights but when the very existence of a people's party, which the Swarajya Party undoubtedly is to-day, is threatened there will be no Indian outside the limited circle of persons known as Government, so unpatriotic as not to stand by it.

### NATIONAL SUPPORT

The nation fully realises its clear duty and there is but one answer it can make to the last attack of the bureaucracy on the right of open trial, conceded to the worst criminal in all parts of the civilised world. That answer will be given by all parties and individuals sinking their differences whether political or communal and by standing shoulder to shoulder together to prevent this outrage on the manhood of India.

#### 257. *Views on Bengal Ordinance and Arrests, 10 November 1924*<sup>1</sup>

Asked to state his first-hand impressions on the situation in Bengal as he found it on his last visit he said:

"Whatever the aim and object of the higher authorities at Simla and Whitehall may have been in sanctioning the present campaign of repression in Bengal, I have not the least doubt in my own mind that the local authorities are directing it mainly against the Swarajya party. Unable to reach the violent revolutionary they are perhaps hoping to terrify him indirectly but the immediate objective is undoubtedly the political party which has proved too strong

<sup>1</sup>The Leader, 13 November 1924.

to be defeated or checked by fair means. But they are absolutely wrong in their calculations. The real culprit is not the man to be terrified nor the Swarajya party the party to be suppressed. Two facts stand out clearly and cannot be got over by any number of misrepresentations and expressions of pious horror at revolutionary crime. The first is that the big round-up in Calcutta on the 25th October and the searches made in other towns did not lead to the capture of a single anarchist against whom there was any definite evidence or to the discovery of any incriminating material such as pistols, revolvers, bombs or their ingredients. The official belief is that a huge quantity of these materials has been imported from foreign countries. The second fact is that out of the 72 persons arrested in the first sweep over 60 are well-known Swarajists and the great majority of them active workers and organisers of the party. Of the remaining 12 one or two are well-known pro-changers who along with others took a prominent part in the Tarakeswar Satyagraha which we know was a Swarajist movement very much detested by the Bengal Government. I give these figures after a scrutiny of the list and enquiries made on the spot. The statement made in a leading Anglo-Indian daily of Calcutta that only three Swarajists have been arrested is untrue. Most of the prisoners are not allowed to be visited by their friends and if some of them are passing through the usual mill which turns out approvers, as is not unlikely, they may be made either to deny all connection with the Swarajya party or to implicate the whole party in some revolutionary crime. In the absence of an open trial any statement made by them will go uncontradicted and in some future communique we shall find it recorded by the Viceroy or the Governor that the Swarajya party was known to the Government to be implicated in revolutionary crime but the Government generously refrained from taking action against the party as a whole."

Asked to give his opinion as to the effect the Calcutta agreement was likely to have on the various political parties he made the following statement:

"There is no reason, why if rightly understood, the arrangement should fail to produce the effect contemplated by us viz., to bring about a united Congress and secure the cooperation of all parties in resisting the repressive policy of the Government. We have taken special care to exclude all matters on which any serious differences have so far arisen and made ample room for all shades of Indian political thought within the fold of the Congress. Let me explain the scheme of the arrangement. Two broad divisions have been made of all Congress activities, i.e., the work in the country and the work in the Councils. As regards the former I am not aware that there is any political party in India which does not attach the very highest importance to the promotion of Hindu-Muslim unity and the removal of untouchability from amongst the Hindus nor that there is any which does not attach at least some importance to handspinning, handweaving and the wearing of handwoven cloth. For the reasons given in the joint statement all sections of the Congress are expected to concentrate on this work, but it does not follow that all other work, however useful and necessary, is entirely excluded. Take for instance, the present campaign of repression in Bengal. Surely the Congress will not stand out and look on while these atrocities are committed in the name of law and order. It will certainly do no less but might and ought to do more than



the Congress used to do, viz., denounce the exercise of these arbitrary powers in unqualified language. I expect that the agitation against the new Ordinance already started will grow in extent and volume until the Ordinance is withdrawn and that all political parties will heartily join in it. Again it will be open to all parties in the Congress to move any resolution they like. The programme of non-cooperation was, so far as I am aware, the only deterrent to the seceders from rejoining the Congress. That programme being practically suspended in its entirety, all parties will be free to ventilate their own views on the Congress platform and, if possible, to convert others to their views. The boycott of foreign cloth is the only part of the non-cooperation programme which remains intact but that is to be accomplished by the spread of hand-woven cloth and not by any direct method to which objection might be taken. It will be observed that we have avoided the use of the word 'boycott' and express what we mean by the words 'refusal to wear cloth made out of India'

The second broad division is the work in the Councils. That has been left to the Swarajya party on behalf of the Congress and the latter has been recognised as an integral part of the Congress organization. I find this has been made a ground of complaint in certain quarters, but fail to understand how anyone who has followed the controversy between the two wings of the Congress can have any objection to it. The Swarajya party did not for a moment go out of the Congress as the seceders did years ago. The welding together of the component parts of the Congress was obviously a necessary preliminary to the process of uniting parties admittedly outside the organization. The Swarajya party is the party in the Congress which favours Council-entry and is at present strongly represented in almost all the legislatures in the country. What was more natural than that the work in connection with those legislatures should be entrusted to it? But it is asked what place will the political parties at present outside the Congress who similarly favour Council-entry have in the organization when they rejoin it. The answer is simple. It will be for all such parties to come together and, if possible, to arrive at an agreement with the Swarajists as to the policy and programme to be followed. If such an agreement can be arrived at, all parties will merge into the Swarajya party and carry on the work together. If not, every party will work on its own lines but so long as the Swarajya party continues to be the predominant political party in the country, as it undoubtedly is today, that party alone will officially represent the Congress in the various legislatures. In other words, the Congress will continue to be, as it has always been, the National Assembly and so long as it is kept out of its legitimate functions by the Government it will work in the legislatures through the party which amongst pro-Council parties commands a majority and is able to send the largest number of representatives to the various Councils. This is how in my opinion the constitution will work. Having regard, however, to the present political situation and to the fact that it is expected to continue for sometime to come, I see no insurmountable difficulty in the way of all the elected members of the Indian and Provincial Legislatures who are true nationalists to agree to a common programme. It will be noticed that the joint statement leaves it to the Swarajya party to make its own rules and I

shall indeed be surprised if it is unable to find a common ground with other nationalists in the legislatures.

The only point which remains to be noticed arises out of the new franchise accepted in the joint statement. I see no reason why it should displease anybody. It is no hardship on specified occasions to wear *khaddar* which comprises a wide range from the coarsest material to the finest fabrics and can be made to suit all tastes and means. The supply of a fixed quantity of yarn in lieu of a cash payment also does not seem to offend against the principles of any party. Personally I attach great importance to the political and economic value of *khaddar*. There are some who do not, but there being no sacrifice of principle involved, I do not understand why they should not willingly accept the franchise if only in deference to the wishes of Mahatma Gandhi.

The objection that the other parties have not been consulted in arriving at the arrangement ignores the very nature and scope of the arrangement. The Congress had to put its own house in order before asking others to join it. The joint statement represents the arrangement arrived at between Mahatma Gandhi and the Executive Committee of the Swarajya party. It has yet to be adopted by the All-India Congress Committee and the General Council of the Swarajya party before it can be called a concluded agreement. These bodies will meet either in Delhi or Bombay during the last week of November and prominent members of the other parties as also well-known public men belonging to no party will be invited to meet at the same time and place. A genuine attempt will thus be made to bring together all schools of political thought in India."

#### 258. *Invitation for Bombay Conference*<sup>1</sup>

1. The formal conference will begin on Friday, the 21st November, 1924, but Mahatma Gandhi will be glad to meet informally the representatives of all political parties, the leaders of the various parties in the Indian and Provincial Legislatures and such other gentlemen as may wish to see him on the morning of Thursday, the 20th November, from 8 to 11 at his residence, Laburnum Road. It is believed that these informal conversations will help to facilitate the work of the Conference. Mahatma Gandhi regrets he was unable to send personal invitations to the informal meeting owing to shortness of time and has asked me to issue this general invitation through the press in the hope that the gentlemen concerned will not mind it in the circumstances.

2. Invitations to attend the formal Conference have been issued to political parties and individual public men so far as was possible but if there have been omissions, as is feared, it is hoped that well-known parties and gentlemen will not mind them and consider it a public duty to attend.

3. A separate meeting of the elected members of the various legislatures will, if necessary, be arranged at such time and place during the intervals in the sitting of the general Conference as may be determined upon.

4. The All-India Congress Committee and the General Council of the

<sup>1</sup> *The Leader*, 15 November 1924.

Swaraj party will meet as already announced. The 23rd November has been provisionally fixed for the latter but it is hoped that members will arrive in good time to attend the general Conference. The occasion is a unique one and the Swarajists on the All-India Congress Committee and General Council of the party are particularly requested to attend even at some sacrifice.

#### 259. *Views on All Parties Conference, 1 December 1924<sup>1</sup>*

Asked his opinion about the All-Parties Conference he said, "It was a most agreeable surprise to me. Before we actually met in Mozaffarabad Hall there was no sign of real unity on any point. On the previous day Mahatma Gandhi had informally met a number of representative men at his residence. I was present at most of these interviews and found the predominant note to be one of dissent. There seemed to be little likelihood of complete agreement even on the resolution relating to the Bengal Ordinance, which had already been condemned by almost all parties. The next day, at Mozaffarabad Hall, the air was thick with doubt and distrust before the commencement of the meeting and for sometime after, as was evident from the tone of the first few speeches, but as the proceedings went on the atmosphere became clearer and by the time the Drafting Committee finished its labours the members of that Committee with the single exception of Mrs. Besant had fully understood each other and were in complete agreement as to the terms of the resolution on the Ordinance."

### SWARAJIST ATTITUDE

"But", interposed the representative, "the Swarajists are believed to be greatly displeased with the draft as finally settled because it omitted to refer to them as the party against whom the Ordinance was principally aimed."

Panditji replied, "No, that is not correct. I know that some Swarajists have expressed their dissatisfaction at the omission but that is not the general feeling. I don't think I shall be guilty of any breach of confidence, if I tell you that I was quite indifferent and refrained in the Committee from voting on the point. I thought and still think it quite unsportsmanlike for any Swarajist to insist on a complimentary reference to his own party. Mr. Das made the attitude of the Swaraj Party in the matter quite clear in his speech at the open Conference and I don't think there is any Swarajist, who has any complaint now. The Ordinance stands thoroughly condemned by the united voice of India and that is enough to satisfy the party, chiefly affected by it."

### QUESTION OF REAL ADVANCE

The representative then asked, if in his opinion any real advance had been

<sup>1</sup>Forward, 2 December 1924.

made towards uniting all the parties. In reply Panditji said, "I fully believe that a great advance has been made and it is in this connection that I said I was most agreeably surprised. While playing the game myself I have been watching during the past two years how the Moderates, Liberals, No-changers and Swarajists have each been busy building up thick walls around themselves and it was my privilege to see in Bombay how the thickest of these walls could be made to shake to its very foundations and all but crumble down by one breach of united nationalism and one stroke of united action. It was not in the terms of the resolution condemning the Ordinance or the formation of a Committee to explore the avenues for a joint political programme that this remarkable phenomenon was to be seen but in the feeling which lay behind them and showed itself in the earnest endeavour on the part of all to come to a common understanding. I could see a spirit of "Camaraderie" springing up, as if, by magic and spread itself with surprising rapidity among the persons holding opposite views. The Bombay Conference has achieved the first great step towards the union of all political parties by bringing them together in a genuine spirit of compromise and if we only proceed cautiously in taking the next step we shall not have to wait long to realise our dream of a united India".

### UNITED CONGRESS

"Do you expect a united Congress at Belgaum?" asked the representative.

The answer was: "Yes and no. Yes, if we are content with the next natural step and no, if we try to jump over the intervening steps to the top. You will observe that the report of Committee appointed, is not due till the 31st of March which shows we don't expect such a complete union of all parties by the end of December as to make it possible for every one of them to make the Congress platform its own. Indeed no such union is anticipated even after all the avenues are fully explored. All that any reasonable man can expect is to have a common platform in the Congress for all common purposes with separate party platform for other purposes. I have no doubt in my own mind that these common purposes can expand in course of time and there is nothing that is not common to all. There is enough of common purpose to occupy all our time. The age-long questions of communal differences and untouchability can admit of no two opinions. Turning to current politics the Government provided ample scope of joint action by putting up the commission and Ordinances. Besides the Bengal Ordinance we have the Taxation Committee forced upon the country against the will of the Legislative Assembly. The latest news from England is that the recommendations of the Lee Commission are to be totally adopted in spite of the partial and hesitating approval given to them by the Government of India and an overwhelming vote in the Assembly against them. Surely theoretical and academical differences of opinion relating to creed and franchise can wait till after we have got over the common and very much matter of fact troubles. The great thing is to come together for common purposes and not try to achieve them separately. This can to a very great extent be accomplished at the next Congress, if other parties will accept Maulana Mohamed Ali's invitation to hold their separate sessions at Belgaum.

Difficulties about creed and franchise will not come in the way of any party accepting an invitation from the Congress to take part in its deliberations on matters about which there is no difference. Each party will retain its own individuality and yet the decisions arrived at, will have the weight and bear the stamp of all India decisions. I do hope, Maulana Mohamed Ali's invitation will be accepted by all the parties. I am sorry to notice that the Muslim League is proceeding with its arrangements to hold the next session at Bombay, much to the jubilation of the *Pioneer*. But I have sent a long telegram to Mr Jinnah this morning begging him and the Committee of League to reconsider the decision. I trust that the Liberal Federation, the Home Rule League and the Non-Brahman Conferences will all accept the Congress invitation and [I] need hardly add that the Swaraj Party will heartily welcome all."

#### 260. On Communal Relations<sup>1</sup>

During the last fortnight I have held several conferences with leading Hindu and Mussalman residents of Allahabad and have visited different localities where communal hostilities culminated in serious Hindu-Muslim riots. I have also come in direct contact with people generally, both Hindus and Mussalmans and have carefully investigated the causes of communal tension. I have given much anxious thought to devise steps to prevent a recurrence of the regrettable conditions which prevailed in Allahabad during the last Dashera festival. It will serve no useful purpose to trace the origin of each riot and apportion blame for it between the two communities. Generally speaking there has been an ever increasing distrust of each community in the other giving rise to false rumours and a state of armed preparedness in both during the last two or three years. The great bulk of the population, both Hindu and Mussalman, is by nature peaceful and opposed to violence of any kind. But there is undoubtedly a sprinkling of misguided men in both communities who are responsible for false rumours and constantly harp upon the necessity of a preparation for violence not only in self-defence but also to break the pride of their opponents and teach them a lesson. This class of people have seriously interfered with my earnest efforts to bring about a complete reconciliation between the two communities. In spite of their opposition, however, I am thankful to say that I have succeeded in improving the existing conditions and paving the way for a complete restoration of good relations with the help of the people themselves.

#### PANCHAYAT BOARDS

What has been done so far is this. Panchayat boards consisting of an equal number of Hindus and Mussalmans have already been formed in some *mohallas* and are in the course of formation in the remaining *mohallas*. The members of these boards approve the principle of the resolutions passed by the Unity Conference at Delhi in October last and undertake the responsibility of seeing that they are put into practice by their co-religionists. All inter-

<sup>1</sup> *The Leader*, 19 December 1924.

communal questions arising in each *mohalla* are to be decided in accordance with the opinion of the majority of the members of the combined boards, but in cases where all or a majority of the members belonging to one community differ from members belonging to the other the members of both communities will accept the decision given by an umpire and see that it is carried out by their respective co-religionists. In *mohallas* where this agreement has already been arrived at, Hindus and Mussalmans have done me the honour to appoint me their umpire but it is obvious that a number of other gentlemen will also have to be selected as umpires if useful work has to be done throughout the city.

One very satisfactory feature of this arrangement is that each community constitutes itself the guardian of the honour, person and property of the other and undertakes to deal suitably with the delinquents of its own religion. Another equally satisfactory feature is that both Hindus and Mussalmans of every *mohalla* agree to combine in opposing aggressive acts committed in their *mohallas* by residents of other *mohallas* to whichever community the latter may belong. It is evident that a complete return to normal conditions is not possible if the criminal cases now pending in courts against members of both communities are not withdrawn as otherwise the opposing parties and their adherents will naturally lead themselves to a communal bias not only in the prosecution of the cases in the courts, original and appellate, but also in the daily life of the *mohallas* concerned. These parties and their adherents will not fail to inoculate others and whatever the final result of these trials may be it is bound to leave a good deal of bitterness behind. But as the cases are cognisable and not compoundable, the Crown being the prosecutor, the trials can only be stayed by Government. As far as the parties are concerned there is a general desire to withdraw the cases and have the question of compensation to sufferers from the recent riots decided by the *mohalla* panchayat boards. The authorities will be moved in this behalf in due course. So far there is only one exception to this general agreement, but it is hoped that when the other cases are withdrawn the parties in this case also will see their way to come to terms.

I am sorry I have been obliged to leave Allahabad in the midst of these negotiations but have every hope of bringing them to a successful termination on my return early in the first week of January. In fairness to the residents of Allahabad I must not omit to mention that the Mussalmans have through leading *raisas* of their community as well as the representatives of each *mohalla* without any exception done me the honour to put themselves entirely in my hands and have agreed to abide by my decisions and carry out my instructions faithfully in all intercommunal questions and that the Hindus have in a great majority of cases done me the same honour. There is no lack of response from the general body of the Hindus in any part of the city and if I am not in a position to speak on behalf of all Hindus as I have done on behalf of all Mussalmans, it is because I have had no opportunity of visiting several *mohallas* or being visited by residents of these *mohallas*. Wherever I have gone I have with the single exception noted above found complete agreement among all classes of Hindus on the terms I have mentioned. Even in the single exception, which is constituted of a solitary individual, practically the whole

Hindu population of the *mohalla* is solidly in favour of a settlement.

The most pleasant part of the work in this connection was done with some university professors and students. They are heartily cooperating with me and a university Hindu-Muslim union has been formed which has already enlisted a number of Hindu and Muslim students and is rapidly adding to the number of its membership. This union is pledged to cultivate cordial relations among its own members and help in preserving such relations not only in Allahabad but also in different cities from which they come. An important item in the programme which I trust will soon materialise is the formation of a Hindu-Muslim club open to all university professors and students.

#### 261. *Views on New Franchise, 26 December 1924*

*Q.* Many say that the Pact with Mahatmaji is an effort of the Swaraj Party to prove the impracticability of the spinning franchise and thus prepare the country for the leadership of the Swaraj Party.

*A.* That is not true. There certainly are many Swarajists who have serious misgivings as to the success of the franchise and I confess that I am one of them. But none the less we mean to work honestly and to the best of our ability to make it a success. We feel that we are not justified in obstructing Mahatma Gandhi in carrying out a programme, which he thoroughly believes in simply because we have doubts as to its ultimate success. We take it to be our obvious duty to do the utmost we can to help Mahatmaji in carrying out his programme even if our doubts are justified by the event. The effort now put in will not have gone for nothing, as there is bound to be a fairly good response to the appeal of Mahatmaji and to that extent the country will benefit.

The Swaraj Party has never attempted to set itself up in rivalry with the Congress but was started with the object of giving greater strength to the Congress organisations in the country. The highest success that it hopes to achieve is to be so identified with the Congress in the near future as to do away with all distinctions of Swarajists and non-Swarajists, of Pro-changers and No-changers. So long as these distinctions continue the Swaraj Party will have fared ill in carrying out its object, however much it may predominate as a political party in the country.

### HINDU-MUSLIM RELATIONS

*Q.* What do you think of the Hindu and Muslim propaganda of segregation?

*A.* I am sure that it will never do any good to either community. So far as I am concerned I find myself wholly incapable of even thinking on communal lines. All denominational institutions in the country, social or political in my opinion, are so many obstacles in the way of real progress. I hope the work I have begun in Allahabad of forming inter-communal institutions will

be taken up throughout the country and if this is done in right earnest I have no doubt that the denominational institutions, even if they continue to exist, will be made wholly innocuous.

*Q.* What are these inter-communal institutions?

*A.* They are in the nature of Hindu-Mahomedan unions among the University students and in every *Mohalla* of the city which afford facilities to all communities to come together and understand one another. For instance, the Hindu residents of a particular *Mohalla* undertake to guard the Mahomedan residents against any kind of attack on their religion or social customs by the Hindus and the Mahomedans undertake to do the same.

## *262. Views on Swaraj Party vs Government Offices<sup>1</sup>*

"[I am] not aware, on what authority Mr. Sidhwa<sup>2</sup> had said that the Swaraj Party in the Central Provinces, was going to accept office in the provincial Council. The general council of the executive committee of the party has not issued any instructions to the C.P. Swarajists on the subject, and it was not open to them to come to such an important decision without the express permission of the central organization. A meeting of the executive committee of the party would be held at Nagpur on the 11th January to consider the general situation. So far as [I am] aware, no occasion had arisen to reconsider the question of accepting office. The Government had not made any offer without which the question could not arise."

## UNITY COMMITTEE

Asked what he thought of the different opinions expressed by the various political parties within and outside the Congress in the various party conferences held last week and whether he still hoped to arrive at a common understanding in the All-Parties Conference Committee to be held at Delhi, Mr. Nehru replied, "I think the chances of a common understanding are as good today as they ever were. The session of the Congress and the various party conferences held during Christmas week have, if anything, made the air clearer than what it was. We know now with a fair degree of certainty the points upon which a common understanding can be expected and those upon which it cannot. The common points in my opinion cover practically the whole field of our present day political activities and the points of difference can very well wait till after the common object has been attained. As I pointed out in a statement to the press, after the meeting of the All-Parties Conference."

<sup>1</sup>*The Leader*, 4 January 1925.

<sup>2</sup>R. K. Sidhwa; b. 1882; a Parsi Congressman from Karachi, Sind; member, A.I.C.C.; President, Karachi District Congress Committee; Municipal Councillor, Karachi; member, Central Advisory Council of Railways for 22 years, Sind Legislative Assembly, 1937-46; elected Mayor of Karachi in 1939; member, Central Railway Advisory Committee for 8 years, Indian Constituent Assembly, 1946-50 and Provisional Parliament, (1950-52); Union Minister of State for Home Affairs; d. 1957.



rence, the success of the Conference depends upon how it deals with the problems confronting it. It will be absurd to expect a general consensus of opinion on all those problems, but if some of them which are of more immediate importance than others are selected for joint action I see no difficulty in our arriving at a common workable programme."

### MAJORITY AND MINORITY REPRESENTATION

"The crux of the whole question is the majority and the minority representation in the elective bodies and the services and this should in my opinion be the first thing for the conference to tackle I see signs of reasonable concessions on this question on all sides. If this is satisfactorily solved, the rest will be plain sailing I do not expect all parties to merge together nor look upon such merger as a very desirable consummation. What I am hoping for is to discover the farthest point in the national advance to which all parties can march together and leave the rest for future settlement. I am perfectly indifferent as to what may be the ultimate goal set by each party before itself so long as the next stage in the journey is clearly defined and unanimously agreed to.

I would have every party work for its own ultimate goal from its separate platform. . .but all parties to join on one platform for the achievement of the immediate common objective. I have every hope that the All-Parties Conference will be able to accomplish this."

#### 263. *On Deliberations in All Parties Conference, 2 February 1925*<sup>1</sup>

The public will enquire what has happened during the informal consultations after which the sub-committee was adjourned *sine die*. I am sorry to have to state that we were not able to reach final conclusions, but I am happy to be able to say that the atmosphere is undoubtedly clearer for an informal talk. The principals have undertaken to carry on their researches and to sound those they represent in order to find a *via media*. The sub-committee will meet again on February 28 for further informal consultations and then try to reach a workable solution. Some concrete proposals have already been made, the idea being to accept the one or the other or to strike a happy mean between them that would be acceptable to all parties. There is therefore no cause for anxiety, much less disappointment. The small committee appointed to draft a scheme of *Swraj* is continuing its deliberations and it is expected that the draft prepared by it will be available for the consideration of the informal committee on the 28th February.

#### 264. *Comment on Lord Birkenhead's Speech, 10 July 1925*<sup>2</sup>

I am sorry to say that owing to ill-health I cannot now deal with Lord

<sup>1</sup>The Leader, 4 February 1925.

<sup>2</sup>Forward, 11 July 1925.

Birkenhead's speech at any length. I have only glanced through it so far. I am not at all disappointed as I did not expect much from His Lordship, but must confess that even I am surprised at the singular emptiness and self-complacency of the speech. There is nothing in it to show that he has grasped the elements of the Indian situation. Deshabandhu Das made it very clear before his death that we were willing to co-operate if suitable opportunities of honourable co-operation were afforded to us and we were enabled to work unhampered by any extraneous agency for our country's betterment. That door of compromise remains and will remain open but the present constitution remains condemned everywhere—even by Lord Birkenhead—and does not offer any such facilities and opportunities.

What Lord Birkenhead says is in effect this:

"You say the constitution is bad. Those who honestly tried to work it for the first three years say that they did not find it workable. I myself never liked it. But you must be good boys and do the task set by your masters."

We refused to accept the position assigned to us. We cannot co-operate merely to strengthen the hold of Britain on India. We would not have passed through the agony of past five years if we had not felt deeply that the present condition in India cannot be acquiesced in or timely tolerated. So long as those conditions remain unchanged and there appears no real desire on the part of England to meet us fairly and work with us on terms honourable to both parties there can be no real co-operation. Co-operation implies good will on both sides and good will evinced by conduct and not mere words.

### REGULAR KNOWLEDGE OF HISTORY

Lord Birkenhead's memory is short. His knowledge of recent Indian history is very peculiar. We have not forgotten, though he may have, Amritsar and what followed in the year 1919. Nor can we forget the history of the fateful years that came after. The Bengal Ordinance is still there to serve as a rude reminder of our position in our own household. Does he wish us to forget all these merely because of a few fine phrases of him? Or does he think that his *self-complacency and the exhibition of the sharp edge of British sword* which he made the other day will frighten Indian nationalism into tame acquiescence and an ignoble co-operation? If so he is greatly mistaken.

We wish his country no ill. We want our Services to be contented and efficient. But we cannot sacrifice our country to his, nor can we put the claim of the Services above the claim of the unhappy millions of this long suffering land.

265. *On his Health, 11 July 1925<sup>1</sup>*

During the last six weeks I have been receiving a number of letters almost daily from different parts of the country making kind enquiries after my health. A considerable number of these contain valuable suggestions about my treatment based on personal experiences of the writers. I have also received many prescriptions and various kinds of patent and other medicines strongly recommended by the manufacturers, dealers or users. These have owing to my illness remained unacknowledged and have now accumulated to such an extent that I find it impossible to write to all my correspondents and thank them for their kindness and sympathy. I, therefore, beg of them to accept through the press my warmest thanks and grateful appreciation of the keen solicitude they have shown for my health. It is obvious that I cannot adopt all the suggestions made or use all the remedies so kindly supplied to me but they will be duly considered by my medical advisers.

266. *Statement on his joining Indian Sandhurst Committee, 27 July 1925<sup>2</sup>*

It is hardly worth my while to waste time in meeting ignorant criticism. Any person, Swarajist or non-Swarajist, who has taken the trouble to read the rules of the party in the Assembly and to follow the debate on the resolution for the establishment of an Indian Sandhurst, will find no difficulty in understanding and appreciating the step I have taken. But, as you have put the question, it is, perhaps, as well to indicate briefly how I came to take that step. We have now been in the Assembly long enough to understand some of the methods by which the bureaucracy can take advantage of our own rules to put us in the wrong. Our policy is, as I have repeatedly stated, to adapt ourselves, as far as we can, to the changing needs of the situation. So far back as the June session of 1924 at Simla we realised the necessity of relaxing the hard and fast rule of prohibiting members from seeking or accepting nomination to any committee appointed by the Government and added a proviso enabling the party to permit any member to serve in a particular committee if in the opinion of a majority of three-fourths of the members present at the meeting there were special reasons for the party being represented on such a committee. This proviso was sanctioned by a meeting of the All India Swaraj party held in Calcutta in August 1924.

## DECIDED BY EXECUTIVE

As no meeting of the party in the Assembly could conveniently be held before the commencement of the next Simla session I laid the offer of the Government before the executive of All India Swaraj party which controls the action of the Swarajist members in the Assembly and in the Provincial Councils. It was unanimously decided by this committee that there were special reasons

<sup>1</sup>*The Hindustan Times*, 14 July 1925.<sup>2</sup>*The Hindustan Times*, 30 July 1925.

for my accepting the Government offer of membership to the Sken Committee and that I should accept it in anticipation of the formal permission of the party in the Assembly at its meeting in August next. This decision has been complied with by me. It has nothing whatever to do with the Faridpur speech of the late Mr. Das or the recent effusions of Lord Birkenhead. There is no analogy between this Committee and the Muddiman Committee and it is not true to say that the terms of reference to this Committee are limited in any way. I have nothing whatever to do with what the late Commander-in-Chief or the present Secretary of State have said on the subject or even with any action that the Government may or may not take on the report of the Committee when it is submitted. My only concern is to see whether I can under the terms of reference put the case on behalf of the people without hindrance. After giving due weight to the representations made on behalf of the Government I am thoroughly satisfied that the terms of reference in this case are sufficiently wide to enable me to do so. For the rest the Swaraj party does depend upon Government resolutions and decisions and knows exactly how to proceed to the next step.

### DEFENCE ALL-IMPORTANT

Let the wise men, who stick fast to the methods of the Victorian Age, shake their heads in doubt and dismay at present by the utterances of men in authority and write volumes on the so-called inconsistencies of the Swaraj party. The latter will go ahead unmoved and undaunted on the course chalked out, and will never hesitate to make such detours as may be necessary to avoid pitfalls laid on the road. But what surprises me is the strange mentality which sees no distinction between the general reforms in the constitution and a particular reform designed to draw our young men to military career and impart suitable instructions to them. To my mind the addition of one Indian to the number of those capable of taking part in the defence of their country is worth more to the nation than the appointment of ten Indians as Governors of provinces. It is the obvious duty of every Indian, to whatever school of thought he may belong, to help in increasing the number of such men as far as he possibly can.

#### 267. *Statement on Das-Lytton Negotiations*<sup>1</sup>

The account of supposed Das-Lytton negotiations given by 'Wayfarer' in *The Bengalee* is a tissue of untruths relieved here and there by a few half-truths. It is not true that Deshbandhu ever consented to accept ministership on any condition whatever. Nor is it true that any proposals for settlement emanated from him or were accepted by him. It is hardly conceivable that he could have accepted ministership when he was invited by Lord Lytton to the Government House and almost immediately afterwards wrote back to say that it was dishonest for a Swarajist to accept office.

<sup>1</sup>*The Hindustan Times*, 1 August 1925.

## THE WHOLE HISTORY

As for the terms of the alleged statement I have the whole history of the so-called negotiations from Deshbandhu direct. It was his invariable practice to inform me from time to time as soon as anything of any importance to the party happened. I am aware of the fact that a *bonafide* attempt at a settlement was made in very reliable quarters and I fully appreciate the motive which actuated those attempts, now, unfortunately, abortive by the sudden death of Deshbandhu Das. I therefore wish at the very outset to make it quite clear that nothing I am going to say in this statement applies to the gentlemen concerned in those attempts which stand on an entirely different ground.

The sole purpose in issuing this statement is to show that the allegations, made by the 'Wayfarer' on the authority of 'an intermediary', and the 'first-hand informants' referred to by him who, I know, are not the gentlemen concerned in the *bonafide* attempts I have mentioned above, are not true.

I shall now proceed to give such facts as are relevant to my purpose on the direct authority of Deshbandhu himself.

## UNCONDITIONAL RELEASE OF PRISONERS

In his letter dt. 25 January 1925 he said: "The Government is again trying to form a ministry and the vultures are coming down. It is more these people than the Government. But I hear that the Government is also anxious to settle. God knows what they mean. If a settlement is proposed I will communicate with you so that either the Executive Council or the General Council may be consulted. We must also consult Mahatma".

It is clear from the above that when Deshbandhu was writing this letter he was not even aware of the nature of the proposals the Government was supposed to be contemplating. It seems, however, that either the same or the next day he received more definite information. His letter of the 27 January 1925 opens as follows:—

"As my messenger is leaving to-day by Delhi Express- I have to tell you about the latest proposal from the Government not sent to me directly but really intended for me."

Then follow the terms received as to which it is only necessary to say that the unconditional release of political prisoners formed a distinct clause in them. The letter then proceeds:—

"I want your considered opinion. If necessary place it before Executive Council very confidentially. I understand the Government will send for me in the middle of February."

It is therefore clear that the first proposals purported to come from the Government and included the unconditional release of political prisoners.

## BETTER TO DIE

Writing on the 23rd February he said:—

"Whatever policy may be adopted I feel that outside propaganda must be carried on vigorously. I am entirely with you there. The result will be my

arrest but it cannot be helped."

Is this the attitude of a man bent on a compromise on any terms. Here is what he says in the same letter about his own health:—

"My health is yet very bad. How I am writing this I don't know. Hope you will be able to read it. I sleep for one or two hours in the night and not at all during the day. You can imagine my condition. Rajgiri has made me worse. I am so bad that often (I) feel that if I am not to work it is better for me to die."

Is it conceivable that the brave man contemplating a vigorous propaganda which might lead to his arrest while in the agony of a distressing disease was at the same time sacrificing his great ideas for a mess of pottage in the shape of temporary concession?

There was a meeting of the Executive Committee of the All-India Swaraj Party held at Patna on the 8th March under the presidentship of Deshbandhu and the very first item of the minutes of the meeting runs as follows:—

"After a full discussion lasting several hours the following principles were unanimously accepted:—

### THE TERMS

1. Dyarchy should find no support or recognition in any form or shape from the party in any legislature.

2. The party should follow a common policy and adopt a uniform course of action in the several legislatures."

And yet we are told that about this very time Deshbandhu was carrying on secret negotiations to run dyarchy under certain conditions.

In his letter of the 4th April he gave me a copy of certain terms which he said were 'being discussed through a friend'. These also included the release of political prisoners as one of the essential conditions. He then proceeded to say:—

"I have not finally accepted them nor has Lord Lytton. I said when I left Calcutta that if Lord Lytton is really desirous he should send for me. He has not done that yet."

There comes a most significant passage which shows how Deshbandhu intended to deal with the proposals when formally communicated. He says:—

"Come soon and we must agree on a definite proposal to be placed before Lord Lytton should he send for us. If not it does not matter."

It is thus clear that there never was any question of accepting the terms as they were but that counter proposals were to be put forward in consultation with me had Lord Lytton chosen to negotiate with us directly, but if His Excellency did not think fit to do so, the matter was to be dropped.

### CLEAR POLITICAL LEAD

In his last letter to me which he wrote three days before his death, Deshbandhu says:—

"Some thing may come in July or August or even later. I think we should

certainly wait till the next Congress. I believe something may come out of the Reading-Birkenhead conversations. I know you do not attach any importance to it. You may be right but something tells me that they will make some kind of proposals to us. Whether it will be of any real value to us is another matter. But I do not wish to complicate the issue by any Commonwealth Bill or any such thing in the meantime. If nothing acceptable comes the next Congress must give a clear political lead."

The last sentence of the passage I have just quoted clearly shows that whatever he might have thought about the Reading-Birkenhead conversations he entertained no doubts or misgivings as to the course the party was to adopt in case nothing acceptable came. A clear political lead was to be given by the next Congress and we were to go ahead with our policy and programme.

It is not true as said by the 'Wayfarer' that Deshbandhu set forth in his letter "in great detail the terms of settlement to which he and Lord Lytton were agreed". There is not even a passing reference to any terms of settlement in the letter. These are all the passages I need quote from Deshbandhu's letter to me to expose the malicious misrepresentations of the "Wayfarer" in regard to the attitude of Deshbandhu. But I have had the privilege of reading the letter Deshbandhu sent to Mr. Nalini Ranjan Sarker<sup>1</sup> and the following passage occurring in the letter dated 18 June, five days before his death, is an absolute clincher. Referring to the Faridpur speech he said:—

"The situation is big with fate. Our position is that we have said our last word. The onus is on the movement now. I will offer no further statement or explanation."

These are the true facts which have been distorted by the 'Wayfarer'.

## THE INTERMEDIARY

I now come to what happened at No. 2, Beltala Road, where I was putting up during my short stay at Calcutta. No chance visitor could have access to me as I was only allowed by my doctors to give a limited number of interviews between the hours of 9 and 11 in the morning to those who had previously been given appointments by me. One of the gentlemen who had succeeded in getting an appointment was, 'the intermediary' referred to by 'the Wayfarer'. He introduced himself as the person who had been carrying the negotiations between Lord Lytton and Deshbandhu. I patiently listened to what he had to say and asked him to see me later on. When he came next he brought with him a letter from himself addressed to me in which it was stated that Mr. Das had prepared certain terms through him that Lord Lytton had agreed to entertain those terms but that the negotiations had abruptly ended by the sudden

<sup>1</sup>Nalini Ranjan Sarker; b. 1882, participated in the anti-partition agitation, 1905-06, non-cooperation movement, 1920; member, Bengal Legislative Council, 1920-28; Councillor, Calcutta Corporation, 1932, Mayor, 1935; organised with A.K. Fazlul Haq the Krishak Praja Party; Finance Minister, Bengal Government, 1937; member, Viceroy's Executive Council, 1941-42; Finance Minister, Bengal, 1947; Chief Minister of Bengal for two months in 1949; retired, 1952; d. 1953.

death of Mr. Das. The letter contained the offer to continue the negotiations on my behalf in place of Mr. Das but went on to say if I did not care to avail of that offer, the writer would approach the other political parties. To this letter he asked me to give a written reply. I told him that it was not a fact that Mr. Das proposed or accepted any terms of settlement and as for the threat to transfer his services to other parties he was welcome to do so at any moment. Thereupon he drafted another letter in my presence and handed it to me. It runs as follows:—

“My dear Sir,

As you are aware of the negotiations that passed between Lord Lytton and myself regarding a constitutional settlement with Mr. C.R. Das from the communications made to you by Mr. Das himself from time to time, I wonder if you would be prepared in your present capacity as the President of Swaraj Party to carry those negotiations further and arrange a conference with Lord Lytton to which His Excellency told me the other day he was quite agreeable.”

I was then busy in drafting my reply to Mahatma Gandhi's letter placing the whole machinery of the Congress at the disposal of the Swaraj Party and asked him to come later on for the reply. When he came next, my replies to him and Mahatma Gandhi, were ready and I sent both to Mahatma Gandhi, the former simply for his information. It came back after a few minutes without any alteration or suggestion, it was signed and handed over. It ran as follows:—

“Thanks for your letter of the 19th. Deshbandhu Das did communicate to me from time to time certain proposals which he said he had received from Lord Lytton through a friend but was not aware till I met you here after his death that you were the friend referred to. I do not know if those proposals hold good after the recent pronouncement of Lord Birkenhead, but I shall always be ready and willing to discuss with the authorities the situation in Bengal as well as in the rest of the country with a view to an honourable settlement. Deshbandhu was expecting a further communication from Lord Lytton on the subject and should His Excellency be pleased to continue the negotiations with me I shall only be too glad to put myself at his disposal.”

### ONUS ON GOVERNMENT

This is all that happened. I have only to add for the information of all and sundry that it is no use trying to convince me that Mr. Das has committed himself to a particular position. There is no man living who knows more about Deshbandhu's mind than I do. Apart from this the responsibility to give a correct lead to the party is mine and I am going to see my own independent judgment in the discharge of my duties. The resolution passed by the general council of the Party at Calcutta on the 10th July sums up the whole position and the duty of every Swarajist is clear. I have taken the trouble to issue this long statement to put a stop to a most painful controversy. I trust in the good sense of the press to avoid the publication of a matter which is



bound to cause unnecessary pain to the family and friends of Deshbandhu and to further complicate an already complicated situation.

268 *On Tambe's Appointment to the Governor's Executive Council, C. P. and Berar, 10 October 1925<sup>1</sup>*

In accepting his appointment to the Executive Council of the Governor of the C.P. Mr. Tambe has committed the most flagrant breach of one of the fundamental principles of the Swaraj Party. His election to the office of President did not absolve him from the solemn obligation he owed to his Party, to his constituency and to the country to accept no office in the gift of Government. It was his duty, as I conceive it, to resign his seat in the Council and with it the office of President to which he was elected by the suffrage of his party and declare his change of faith publicly before accepting a Government post. The first information I got of his appointment was from the press message announcing it. I do not know what part or lot if any the Council or the Provincial Swaraj Party of the C.P. had in bringing about this appointment. I am making enquiries on the subject and will issue a fuller statement later.

269. *Views on Tambe's Appointment, 15 October 1925<sup>2</sup>*

The reports received from the three Congress provinces from which the members of the C. P. Legislative Council are drawn, viz., C.P. Hindustani, C.P. Marathi and Berar, show that Mr. S.B. Tambe did not resign the membership of the Provincial or the Council Swaraj Party before accepting the office as a member of the Executive Council of the Governor of the C.P. He acted entirely on his own initiative and responsibility without consulting or informing any of these bodies. I am informed that he has now tendered his resignation but he has not yet replied to my telegram asking him to send me such explanation as he might have to offer in justification of the step he has taken. I have called a meeting of the executive of the All-India Swaraj Party at Nagpur on the 1st November to deal with Mr. Tambe's resignation and other matters connected with the C.P. Legislative Council in consultation with a joint meeting of the Provincial Swaraj Committees of the three Congress provinces named above. The decisions arrived at will be duly announced in the press.

270. *Statement on Tambe Affair, 17 October 1925<sup>3</sup>*

I can only express my regretful surprise at the statement reported to have

<sup>1</sup>*The Bombay Chronicle*, 12 October 1925.

<sup>2</sup>*The Bombay Chronicle*, 16 October 1925.

<sup>3</sup>*The Hindustan Times*, 20 October 1925.

been made by Mr. Jayakar on Mr. Tambe's action and the general policy of the Swaraj Party. I cannot conceive how a gentleman in the position of the leader of the Swarajists in the Bombay Council could possibly commit himself to the opinion that the difference between Mr. Tambe's acceptance of office and Mr. V.J. Patel's is merely technical. There is the most essential and substantial difference on general principles between the one accepting an office in the absolute gift of the Government and another accepting office to which he is elected not only by the suffrage of his own Party but in the teeth of Government opposition. It will be remembered that the Government bloc not only voted solid against Mr. Patel but made unusual efforts to secure the votes of those dependent upon it and also other Independent members. Mr. Tambe in office is a creature of the Government pure and simple. Mr. Patel in office is as much an elected representative of his Party as he was out of office.

### DIFFERENCE ADMITTED

There is no doubt one important difference between Mr. Patel in the presidential chair and Mr. Patel in the Opposition bench. In the former place he is to decide impartially the questions arising between his Party on the one side and the Government and parties on the other. In the latter it was his business to put forward the case of his own Party with all the strength and ability he could command. The difference is the same as there is between a judge and an advocate; but is limited to points of order and procedure. On the merits of every question that comes up before the Assembly Mr. Patel in the chair is fully entitled to have his own opinions, though he may not express them. That is a situation which frequently arises in inter-parties matters quite independently of the Government. When a joint meeting of two or more parties is held, it has to be presided over by a member of one of the Parties concerned who is duly elected. In agreeing to preside such a member is bound by the same obligations of fairness and impartiality as Mr. Patel is in the presidential chair of the Assembly; but he does not thereby cease to be a member of the Party to which he belongs, nor is he released from the undertakings he has given.

### PARTY'S CONSTITUTION

Apart from these well established general principles, the constitution of the Party, while it clearly and absolutely prohibits the acceptance of office in the gift of the Government equally clearly provides that "the Party may adopt one of its own members or any other elected member of the Assembly as a candidate for election to the office of the President of the Assembly." It will thus be seen that there is not the remotest analogy between the two cases.

It is not true that both men have been lost to the Party in the same sense. Mr. Patel will on the expiry of the term of his office be free from the limitations I have mentioned above and resume his place in the Party as full-fledged Swarajist; while Mr. Tambe has cut himself off completely from the Party at the very outset and can never hope to return to it. I cannot understand how Mr. Tambe's action can have a weakening effect on future issues. By his

action Mr. Tambe has only shown himself up and left the Party as it was.

### LAXITY OF DISCIPLINE

I do not know what Mr. Jayakar is referring to when he speaks of the 'present laxity of discipline'. There have been and will always be black sheep in every class. The mere defection of a member does not show any laxity of discipline. It all depends upon how the particular member is dealt with by the Party and Mr. Jayakar would have done well to wait for the action which is going to be taken by the Executive Committee of the General Council of which he himself is a member. It is painful to find the leader of the Party in the Bombay Council professing ignorance as to whether the Party's programme has succeeded or not.

Mr. Jayakar's remarks about the Party acting 'like honourable courageous and patriotic men' and 'honestly putting the case before the electors' are out of place and unwarranted.

### SIGNIFICANCE OF RECEPTION

He doubts whether the reception accorded to Mr. Patel in Bombay was genuine and on the assumption that it was genuine considers that it 'marks a clear change in public feelings'. All I can say is that I see no reason to doubt the genuineness of the reception and that in my judgement the public of Bombay appreciated the position more correctly than Mr. Jayakar has done. They honoured Mr. Patel because he wrested the office of the President of the Assembly from the unwilling hands of the Government by the vote of his own Party and that of other Independent and impartial members of the Assembly and also because having accepted the office he discharged its duties in a manner which has excited the admiration of friends and foes alike. Mr. Tambe can expect no such honour, however ably he may discharge the duties of his new office.

#### 271. *Meeting of the General Council of the Swaraj Party, 21 October 1925*<sup>1</sup>

The meeting of the General Council of the Swaraj Party at Nagpur on the 1st November was announced by the General Secretary under a misapprehension of my telegraphic instructions and has, therefore, been cancelled. The meeting [I intended] to call was that of the Executive Committee of the General Council which is quite competent to deal with the situation. Meetings of the General Council having only recently been held in Calcutta and Patna, it was considered unnecessary to put all the members nearly 400 from different parts of India to the trouble and expense of undertaking another long journey so soon after. For the present, therefore, it is only necessary to call a meeting of the Executive Committee of the General Council at Nagpur on the 1st November. Should it hereafter appear advisable the General Council will be summoned to meet at a convenient time and place. Meanwhile, it is hoped that there will be a full attendance of the members of the Executive Committee at Nagpur.

<sup>1</sup>*The Bombay Chronicle*, 23 October 1925.

*DEBATES, LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY*

272. *Grant of Full Self-Governing Dominion Status to India, 8 February 1924*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nebrū<sup>2</sup>: Sir, I beg formally to move the amendment that stands in my name. It runs as follows:

"That the following be substituted for the original Resolution:

"This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to take steps to have the Government of India Act revised with a view to establish full responsible Government in India and for the said purpose:

- (a) to summon at an early date a representative Round Table Conference to recommend with due regard to the protection of the rights and interests of important minorities the scheme of a constitution for India; and
- (b) after dissolving the Central Legislature to place the said scheme for approval before a newly-elected Indian Legislature for its approval and submit the same to the British Parliament to be embodied in a Statute."

Sir, I am very glad that I have had an opportunity of listening to the speakers who have preceded me. I hope now to be better able to deal with my proposition and with the position which I mean to lay before the House for its acceptance. As will be seen, the proposition divides itself into three parts. The first declares the goal; the second and third the various stages which have to be gone through to reach the goal. Now, so far as the first part is concerned, there is no exception taken to it to-day in this House, nor, as far as I am aware, has any objection been taken before this outside this House. The whole controversy ranges round the other two parts. But the Honourable the Home Member has raised certain questions which have reference to the first part also and I shall beg with your permission to refer to them at a later stage of my remarks.

I wish, first of all, to thank my friend, Mr. Rangachariar, for the very graceful compliment he has paid to the Swarajists and for the welcome he has extended to them in this House. I am particularly glad to find that my Honourable friend has admitted, though I do not know if he is aware of it, that he is not very far removed from a Swarajist. When referring to the glass dome and his intention to throw stones upon it at some future time, he was really saying what the Swaraj Party has been saying for some time past, and what the Congress, ever since it resorted to a policy of non-cooperation, has been preaching to the country. He is, or if he is not yet, he will, I hope, be a very valuable acquisition to our ranks, and we shall welcome him with open arms. Now, Sir, beyond this I do not think it is necessary for me to deal with the remarks of my friend, Mr. Rangachariar, and I shall simply lay few broad facts before this House in support of the proposition which I have the honour to move. It will be seen, as I have submitted, that the first part of my proposition is unexceptionable. That there is a deep-seated desire for Swaraj in the country I do not think any one will doubt. That that

<sup>1</sup>The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. IV, Part I, 30th January, 1924 to 15th February, 1924, Delhi, 1924, pp. 367-75.

<sup>2</sup>Motilal Nehru represented the Cities of the United Provinces Non-Muhammadian Urban constituency in the Indian Legislative Assembly.

desire proceeds from the natural cravings of the human heart for freedom, I do not think any one will seriously deny. That being so, I say the first and the last requisite for full responsible government is completely established. According to all modern conceptions, what you have to look to is a genuine desire proceeding from the natural instinct to which I have referred and the determination to attain that desire. That is all that entitles a nation, that is all that has ever entitled a nation, to complete self-government and complete responsibility. But I am not going to put my case so high to-day. The desire for Swaraj, as all must be aware in this House, has passed through the usual stages of ridicule and intimidation, rather unusually prolonged, and has now, it may be said, and properly said, emerged from an ordeal of fire, unscathed and pure. That desire has led different sections of my countrymen to different courses of action. It is all a question of the intensity of the feeling of each section, the point of view of each section and the mentality of each section of my countrymen. That each has been prompted and guided by the best of motives there can be no doubt whatever. The question then is; have we made out a case for the realisation of that desire? Well, what is asked for in my friend, Mr. Rangachariar's Resolution and what I ask for by my amendment is, without mincing words, a complete overhauling of the Government of India Act. The Honourable the Home Member has made a very strong case, or at least has attempted to do so, against that proposition. Now, Sir, what is the chief plank in his argument, and what is the great argument that has always been employed against any further advance in political rights to be given to the Indians? It is said that those who desire any further advance are precluded by the Government of India Act itself from making the demand, because the Preamble sets out in clear words that responsible government will only be granted by successive stages and that Parliament shall be the sole judge of the manner and measure of each advance, or words to that effect. And it is said that you have no business to come forward and ask for anything. It is for you to satisfy Parliament, to satisfy us who are the agents of Parliament here—I mean the Government—that you deserve a further advance and you shall have it but not before that. Now, Sir our answer, straight and clear, as unequivocal as the Preamble, is that that Preamble is bad, the whole law, the whole Act is as bad as could possibly have been devised to postpone, to stifle and to suppress the natural desire which I have already mentioned. That is what we say and we are perfectly entitled to say so. We feel that we must say so. What answer is it that the Act provides so and so, when the one reason why we do not want it is precisely because it provides so and so. Sir, it is arguing in a circle. We say that the Act has done a gross injustice to us in that Preamble and in the subsequent provisions of it which refuse to us the full rights of responsible government that we demand. It is said: "You will not have them because the Act does not allow you to ask for them, but leaves it to the judgment of Parliament alone." Now, Sir, I ask what special sanctity is there in this particular Act of Parliament that we must not say a word against it? Wherein does it differ from other Acts of Parliament, all of which may be modified or repealed at any time? We ask for the modification of this Act or for its repeal, whatever may be necessary, and in doing so I really do not know what unconstitutional or improper act we are

guilty of. Well, Sir, if it is true that we may ask for the modification of a piece of legislation which we take exception to, we are not going beyond our rights.

Then the next question is, "Is the modification that we ask for justified under the circumstances?" That really is the crux of the whole matter. It has been said—and I have been hearing a considerable amount of loose talk during the last three or four days outside this House—that the Act contains within itself enough to give us that from which we can grow, from which we can acquire more by the building up of conventions and things of that sort. I wish at once to dispose of that argument. I say that, so far as I am concerned, it will take very strong authority, and that of the weightiest character, to convince me that any conventions can grow so as to defeat the express provisions of a Statute of Parliament. They are simply talking as if this Statute did not exist. But, even if such conventions could grow, I submit we are not content to let them grow in the way in which it has been suggested. We wish that our rights should be formulated, recognised and clearly admitted, and not only admitted and recognised but actually conceded to us.

Now, as for the steps, the argument is that the Government are in fact doing the very thing that the Resolution and the amendment ask for, because what is called the working of the reforms constitutes the steps which are to be taken to secure the ultimate revision of the Government of India Act, and, in insisting upon the working of the reforms as they stand, we are doing all that is necessary to secure the revision of the Act and the inevitable establishment of responsible government after all the steps mentioned in the Act have been taken. Now, Sir, our submission is—and I am glad that the Honourable the Home Member has not been able to point to anything that I have said before I came to this House which conflicts with what I am going to submit now—we in the Congress have demanded ever since the year 1919 full responsible government; call it Swaraj, call it Dominion status, call it anything you like. The Honourable the Home Member has not paid attention to one very important fact that after the year 1919 the Congress has committed itself to a policy and a programme which were quite new and which had not been adopted before that year. I submit that it will serve no useful purpose except perhaps that of historical research to cite what the Congress said or what the leader of the Congress said in the years 1916, 1917 and 1918 and in previous years. From the year 1919 up to the present day the demand has been consistent that what we require is responsible government, that the Government of India Act is wholly inadequate and disappointing. The Congress has said that it will not rest until it has obtained either a revision or a repeal of that Act. That was the position under which the Act came into force and that is the position under which now it begins its second course. At this stage my friend, Mr. Rangachariar, thinks that it is not so improper as the Honourable the Home Member thinks to ask for a revision of the Act. As I have said, Sir, we have got to see other things besides the provisions of the Act itself if we wish to come to a right conclusion as to whether the time has come for its revision or not. What are we suggesting? We are not asking for complete responsible government to be handed over to us tied up in a bundle. We say we are quite capable of it, we are quite fit for it, but what is

it that my amendment is suggesting? It simply suggests what the Honourable the Home Member says they are not unwilling to do, but upon conditions. In fact, when you come to examine the position as disclosed by the speech of my Honourable friend Mr. Rangachariar and the Honourable the Home Member, the whole thing resolves itself into this, are we going to take this Committee fettered with the condition which the Honourable the Home Member has proposed? In effect he says, "We stick to the principle of the Bill, we have no objection to exploring the avenues of improvement whether they are found within the four corners of the Act or without, but one thing must be certain and that is that we are not prepared to admit your claim to full responsible government or Dominion status." I may tell you at once that, so far as my Party is concerned, it will take a round table conference, or committee, or whatever other name you may give it, but the scope of that committee or that conference must not be limited. It must go into the whole matter. It must have the right to recommend whatever it considers proper. After all, it has no statutory powers, it is not a thing which can bind all parties for all time to come. It can only make recommendations and upon those recommendations we ask the necessary steps to be taken to give them the sanction of law.

The fact is, Sir, that my amendment has been considerably toned down to meet the wishes of friends who are not Swarajists in this Assembly. It seemed to me that there could be no possible objection taken to it from the Government side but, when we find that even such a mild, such a modest, request as this simply asking for a conference to go into the whole matter to find out for itself what is to be done and what is not to be done, is to be subjected to conditions, then I really do not know what Resolution would have been mild enough for the Government Benches to accept. However that may be, it is my duty to make my position as perfectly clear as the Honourable the Home Member has made his. What we are asking for is not intended to convey something by way of a threat as has been believed in certain quarters and as has been hinted at by my Honourable friend the Home Member. We are putting before the Government an honest and a fair demand. This is the demand not only of the Swarajists but also of a very large number of the elected Members of this House, as the House will know by and by when other Honourable Members rise in their places to support it. It is not fair to tell us that you can only do this or you cannot do that. It is not fair to treat our demand as a threat and to threaten us in return with dire consequences if we dare to make it. What I say is this: whatever we can do in this House, it is quite obvious that it must be done within the rules and within what is called the constitution. Personally speaking, I say there is no constitution for India. I refuse to believe in this constitution. I agreed to come into this Assembly and I am bound by the rules. That is the only thing that I consider binding. I do not think that anything deserves the name of a constitution for a country in the making of which the people of the country did not have a voice, and for that reason I say that I do not give it the dignity of a constitution, although I submit to the rules. Now, if we submit to the rules, it is open to us to do certain things under these rules in this House and in the Provincial Councils. If we can obstruct you under the rules, what is there to prevent us



from doing so as an answer to the attitude that you adopt? Sir, I may at once say that the Swarajya Party has sought the suffrage of the electorates not to engage itself in the humdrum business of putting questions and getting answers and acquiescing in the process marked out in the Act itself for further stages of advance and similar things.

We have come here to do something which we have not been doing so far. I think it will mightily please my friends of the Congress who are known by the name of "No-changers" to hear what I am about to say,—but I do not mind it, I have never concealed it; Sir, we have come here to offer our co-operation, non-co-operators as we are, if you will care to co-operate with us. That is why we are here. If you agree to have it, we are your men; if you do not, we shall, like men, stand upon our rights and continue to be non-co-operators. Now what threat is there in this? When I say what I am, what threat do I convey? Am I conveying any new idea? If we conform to the programme of non-co-operation, are we doing something that we have not been doing? We have so far been working outside the Councils and this Assembly with a definite object. That object we have still in view, that object we consider perfectly legitimate. But we have come here because the dust and heat of the controversy which has been raging for the last three or four years, in fact ever since the inauguration of these reforms, has obscured the real issues. We have come here and our coming here affords an opportunity to clear those issues as no other opportunity can. We are here for that purpose. We are not here simply to wreck or to destroy. We have been referred to as a party of destruction, and wreckers. Yes, we are out to wreck and destroy things of evil, and, rightly or wrongly, we think that the present reforms are a thing of evil. We have come to ask you to meet us so that we may put our heads together,—to hear us and to let us hear you and then to come to some definite conclusion. If we agree, well and good; if we do not we shall agree to differ, and the issues will be clarified. That is the thing. It is no business of ours to wreck things which we believe are doing good to the country. At least it will be admitted that we have no personal motives. We have not any axes of our own to grind. We believe in a certain principle. We believe that our country has reached a particular stage, and that at that particular stage it is entitled to certain rights, which rights are being withheld from it. We say that we cannot get those rights by an armed revolution, by delivering a great thumping blow, which alone in other countries has gained freedom for the people of those countries. In the very nature of things we cannot do that and therefore we say, we shall simply not assist you. What law, what reason, is there which can compel us to co-operate with people who do not co-operate with us? However, I am not here, Sir, to justify the principles of non-co-operation, but I certainly am here to say that we claim to be as much bound by our own principles as any honourable body of men has ever claimed to be, and that is all.

certainly so. But I should like the Honourable the Home Member to answer the question, suppose there had been a dozen Prime Ministers and a dozen Governments in this interval of four years, would these reforms have been three times as good as they are to-day? I do not understand, Sir, I say with due deference, what has the change of Government or the change of Prime Ministers to do with a good or bad piece of legislation or with the fact whether it is suited to the circumstances of the country or not. Well, I think I would attach more value to the opinion of the Honourable the Home Member than I would to those of all the Prime Ministers that have held office ever since the beginning of Parliament up to this date. Why? Because he knows what I know, perhaps more. My only trouble with him is that I cannot get him to feel as I feel. My trouble with Parliament, with Prime Ministers and with the British public is that I cannot impart to them the knowledge which my friend the Honourable the Home Member possesses. Then there is the British public. It has been said that the British people must also be taken to have set their seal of approval upon these reforms, because there have been these frequent changes of Government. Well, Sir, I should have imagined that this rapid succession of Prime Ministers and Governments only went unmistakably to show that your home politics are in a hopeless muddle and that you cannot either afford the time or have the inclination to pay attention to matters outside, strictly speaking, the circle of your home politics, such as India and Dominion status for India. But however that may be, it is a fact which I know personally, and which my friend Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya also knows, as we have both tried to gain a hearing at the bar of the august body known as the British people or the British public, that it is impossible under the best of conditions for Indians to secure a hearing in that great tribunal. We tried to do so and everybody knows how miserably we failed. It is impossible for us to approach that body. We can approach the Prime Minister; we can approach the Secretary of State; we can approach the Honourable the Home Member here and the other Government Members but the British public is altogether intangible and is something like the will-o'-the-wisp, which the further we follow the further it recedes. That is our experience. We therefore decided for want of anything better to depend upon ourselves and that is what we are doing.

Now, Sir, the process laid down is nothing, I submit, but a reversal of the natural order of things. What the Government of India Act provides is that an extraneous authority has the right to determine the stages, the manner, the measure and the time for the advance of a nation to attain its freedom. I do not think there is any one who will question now or seriously argue against the proposition that if there is anything by which nations and communities—big and small—should be governed and should be guided, it is their own will. The House will be pleased to observe that clause 3 of my amendment has a direct reference to and is suggested by the right of self-determination. Now, that is the principle which we want the British Government and Parliament to accept. That is the principle which it will be for the round table conference first to say whether it is prepared to recommend and then for the new Legislature which I purpose in the third clause of my amendment to accept.

Now, Sir, I may briefly explain clauses 2 and 3. It will be observed that we

have left out all details and we did so because we thought they would more properly form the subject of subsequent negotiations and subsequent conversations. But I must make it perfectly clear that the representative round table conference mentioned in clause 2 must be really representative to the satisfaction of this House. It was intended at first to mention certain proportions but it was subsequently decided to drop them and to leave the word 'representative' there. That, I submit, is an essential condition of that clause of the amendment. Then, when we come to clause 3, I find that there is an amendment to that amendment of mine which is proposed by Dr. Gour. I do not know what his reasons are for omitting that clause because his amendment simply seeks to drop the third clause of my amendment. I wish to hear his reasons when he moves it and, if I have no right of reply, I hope some Honourable Member who will hear his reasons will be able to reply to him. For the present however I content myself by saying that that clause affords the only reason for having a conference and provides the only way by which you can ascertain the will of the people. I can understand a certain amount of nervousness on the part of my friend about another general election, but I can assure him that he will receive the same assistance as he did last time—if he withdraws his amendment.

Another reason why we want this new Legislature to be elected is the same as was put forward by the Honourable the Home Member. He wants the best of India to agree to anything that is to be done so that there will be no future difficulties on the score of the constitution or of the rules or of the exact rights which are going to be taken by us or given by the Government as it likes to put it. Now, I want also the best of India to come to this Legislature. As we are all aware, many of our best men are suffering from disqualifications and have not been able to contest the elections. I want them to be here. As for the proposal of my friend, the Home Member, that he wants the best of the people to agree to the arrangement, I can only say that it will all depend upon the manner in which the best of India is approached or if, I may put it the other way, in which the advances or the approach made by the best of India are received by the Government.

Now, I shall try to answer the questions which have been put by the Honourable the Home Member. I will first make the general observation that all these questions are really answered by the terms of the amendment which I have put forward before the House, because there is nothing in that amendment, as I said before, which asks that something should be done to-day without consulting the very interests, the very persons which the Honourable the Home Member mentioned are very necessary to be consulted. His first question was: Is this Dominion status to be confined to India or will it include Indian States as well, and, if so, on what terms? I say it all depends on our preliminary conversations. If the Indian States want to come in, let us have their representatives too. If they do not want to come in, we do not want them. All the questions that have been put are, I submit, sufficiently answered by one or the other clause of my amendment.

Then the next thing was that Dominion status of course implies protection of the Dominion by its own armies. I do realise that and we are perfectly willing to confer with you as to how that may be done. We do require men to

protect our Dominion with our own armies, but is it at all fair on your part to turn to us whom you have deprived even the use of arms, who cannot even have such training in the use of arms as you give in your schools and colleges? And why, because you have prohibited it. I say, is it fair of you to turn round and tell us "You have got to be armed; you have no Army and therefore you cannot have Dominion status." What Army have you got? Is it not the Indian Army—I do not say it is the sole Army that protects us but is it not the largest factor in the British Army in India? I need not go into what the Indian Army has achieved because that is a very long story and everybody knows it. Were they Indian soldiers or were they not?

When it comes to the carrying on of the government, I find three distinguished countrymen of mine on the Government Benches. You talk of Hindu-Moslem differences. Well, without prying into official secrets, I think I may ask for information whether these three gentlemen—one from Bengal, the other from the Punjab and the third from Madras—whether these gentlemen, when deciding matters relating to the administration, have been flying at each other's throats in the Executive Council Chamber. I mean, what is there that cannot be done if of course the proper steps are taken; and it is the taking of the proper steps upon which we lay special insistence. The steps may take some time; I do not say that everything has to be accomplished in a night. But to say that you are not entitled to it and you will not get it because we have said so—that is a position of great unfairness to which we are not going to submit.

Then the next question is, there are these communal differences. Of course communal differences there are. Unfortunately they exist. We have not denied them. But as my friend the Honourable the Home Member has read an extract from the Congress Civil Disobedience Inquiry Committee, where the existence of these communal differences has been admitted, perhaps he will like to hear what he has overlooked—the remedy suggested and the reason for it.

Now in that report we find—paragraph 70 begins thus (I have not got the report but I read from the Annual Register):

"The Prime Minister of England in the famous speech recently delivered by him in the House of Commons has thus justified the maintenance of the Indian Civil Service for all time to come:

'There is great variety of races and creeds in India, probably greater variety than in the whole of Europe. There are innumerable divisive forces there, and if Britain withdrew her strong hand, nothing would ensue except divisions, strife, conflict and anarchy'."

The Report proceeds:

"Now the strong hand of Britain is the 'British Civil Service in India.' Remove the cause of 'divisions, strife, conflict and anarchy' and you take away the sole justification for the continuation of that distinguished service. There can be no question that inter-communal differences constitute the sole cause of 'divisions, strife, conflict and anarchy' and that inter-communal unity which means the removal of that cause means also the removal of all justification for the continuance of the Civil Service."

Then, after dealing with the causes, the Committee go on to say:

"The only radical cure for the disease is the entire elimination of the mischief-maker; but that, in view of the conflict of interests we have pointed out above, cannot happen unless and until the costly maintenance of the Indian Civil Service ceases to depend upon 'divisions, strife, conflict and anarchy'; in other words, unless and until Swarajya is fully established. It is only then that the mischief-maker will lose his occupation and think of some other opening for his activities."

But, Sir, it is said by my learned friend that in spite of these differences he is willing to have some sort of inquiry. He has excluded certain things, however, from that inquiry, namely, the question of the immediate grant of Dominion status, and he has not given us full information as to what are the questions on which he would go to this Committee for inquiry. He has indicated that the advance that is necessary may be found within the four corners of the Act itself or that it may be necessary even to recast some portions of the Government of India Act; but not wholly modify it as is demanded by the Resolution of my friend and by my amendment. That is a question, Sir, which does not arise at the present moment

I should like to say one more word, Sir, before I sit down and that is that the opportunity which this occasion offers is an opportunity which should not be thrown away either by the Government or by us. It will serve no useful purpose to continue the state of things which has existed during the last few years. The Government is very well aware that there is a section of the public of India which cannot be entirely ignored and which demands for the country certain rights and is prepared to put those rights before you, but is not likely to be frightened away by threats. It is not prepared to submit to conditions which are foreign to its policy, but is fully prepared to bear all the consequences of its action, action which it has decided upon after mature and deliberate consideration. I say this simply because the tone of the debate as set by my friend, Mr. Rangachariar, was different to the tone of the debate as modified by the Honourable the Home Member. I have said already, and I repeat it again, that we are not here to threaten anybody, nor even in our activities outside is it any part of our business to threaten anybody, and I submit that what is taken as a threat certainly was not intended to be a threat. All that we want is that you should consider the proposition which we place before you in the same mood without saying that this thing or that thing will happen to us. It must be remembered that we, some of us at least, have burnt our boats behind us. We take our stand upon these rights, and it does not matter to us in the least what happens so long as we go on rendering such service to our country as we believe our country is entitled to.

Now, Sir, I do not propose to go into the distinction, the fine distinction, which the Honourable the Home Member has drawn between responsible Government and Dominion status and all the rest of it, but all I ask, and the whole object of my remarks is, that the Honourable the Home Member should reconsider his observations in regard to the conditions that he wants to impose upon either a committee or a conference or other agency which may be appointed. If he can see eye to eye with me on that point, if he agrees to remove all the conditions on behalf of the Government, then it will be for the

protect our Dominion with our own armies, but is it at all fair on your part to turn to us whom you have deprived even the use of arms, who cannot even have such training in the use of arms as you give in your schools and colleges? And why, because you have prohibited it. I say, is it fair of you to turn round and tell us "You have got to be armed; you have no Army and therefore you cannot have Dominion status." What Army have you got? Is it not the Indian Army—I do not say it is the sole Army that protects us but is it not the largest factor in the British Army in India? I need not go into what the Indian Army has achieved because that is a very long story and everybody knows it. Were they Indian soldiers or were they not?

When it comes to the carrying on of the government, I find three distinguished countrymen of mine on the Government Benches. You talk of Hindu-Moslem differences. Well, without prying into official secrets, I think I may ask for information whether these three gentlemen—one from Bengal, the other from the Punjab and the third from Madras—whether these gentlemen, when deciding matters relating to the administration, have been flying at each other's throats in the Executive Council Chamber. I mean, what is there that cannot be done if of course the proper steps are taken; and it is the taking of the proper steps upon which we lay special insistence. The steps may take some time; I do not say that everything has to be accomplished in a night. But to say that you are not entitled to it and you will not get it because we have said so—that is a position of great unfairness to which we are not going to submit.

Then the next question is, there are these communal differences. Of course communal differences there are. Unfortunately they exist. We have not denied them. But as my friend the Honourable the Home Member has read an extract from the Congress Civil Disobedience Inquiry Committee, where the existence of these communal differences has been admitted, perhaps he will like to hear what he has overlooked—the remedy suggested and the reason for it.

Now in that report we find—paragraph 70 begins thus (I have not got the report but I read from the Annual Register):

"The Prime Minister of England in the famous speech recently delivered by him in the House of Commons has thus justified the maintenance of the Indian Civil Service for all time to come:

"There is great variety of races and creeds in India, probably greater variety than in the whole of Europe. There are innumerable divisive forces there, and if Britain withdrew her strong hand, nothing would ensue except divisions, strife, conflict and anarchy'."

The Report proceeds:

"Now the strong hand of Britain is the 'British Civil Service in India.' Remove the cause of 'divisions, strife, conflict and anarchy' and you take away the sole justification for the continuation of that distinguished service. There can be no question that inter-communal differences constitute the sole cause of 'divisions, strife, conflict and anarchy' and that inter-communal unity which means the removal of that cause means also the removal of all justification for the continuance of the Civil Service."

Conference to make recommendations. The Government will be represented and every possible interest will be represented.

273 *Grant of Full Self-Governing Dominion Status to India, 13 February 1924<sup>1</sup>*

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, I thank you for allowing me this opportunity to speak, as I understand that you are going to put the proposition of Dr. Gour at an early stage of the debate. I would beg your permission to deal with it after I have made a few general remarks.

Sir, when I rose to make my opening speech, I congratulated my friend, the Honourable Mr. Rangachariar, for having unconsciously admitted that he was a Swarajist. I am to-day in the happy position of being assured in unmistakable language by my friend, Sir Basil Blackett<sup>2</sup>, that we are all Swarajists here. Well, that is a sign of encouragement and of hope, we find that there has been a considerable change in the viewpoint of the Government Benches during the last five weeks and I hope and trust that, before we come to the end of this debate, there may be a still greater change in that viewpoint and differences may be minimised. I shall not enter, Sir, into an unprofitable comparison between past administrations and the present administration. I shall content myself with uttering what is a truism, namely, that India is thoroughly discontented at this moment.

It will serve no useful purpose to lay the blame in any particular quarter and to protest innocence for some other quarter. The fact remains that discontent is there, and that this discontent is political in its nature. It may have for its foundation, for its origin, economic and other causes also, but mainly it is of a political nature. Now that being so, and it being admitted that we are all for establishing responsible government in this country, the only difference being that of degree and method, the question resolves itself into whether the stages which the Government of India Act provides and upon which the Government Benches rely are the proper stages, or those which I have submitted to this House in the shape of an amendment to the Resolution of my friend, Mr. Rangachariar. Sir, it appears that in this matter the ordinary course of things is being reversed. We find that the sober morning coat is for delay (A Voice: "Unreasonable delay") while the more sober if somewhat cumbersome *dhoti* is all for expedition. (A Voice: "Unreasonable expedition.") I hope that we shall soon come to an understanding upon that point too. Now, Sir, the great point which has been made by the previous speakers and which has been referred to by Sir Basil Blackett in his speech arises out of the theory of "trust" and "trustee." I have often wondered as a lawyer as to what that may mean. Who is the author of this trust? Where is the appointment of the trustees, and who are the trustees? We find that the English people came to this country as tradesmen; they thought it would be a good thing to remain

<sup>1</sup>The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. IV, Part I, 30th January, 1924 to 18th February, 1924, Delhi, 1924, pp. 542-48.

<sup>2</sup>Basil Phillott Blackett; b. 1882; Secretary, Indian Finance and Currency Commission, 1913-14; member, National War Savings Committee, 1916; Representative of British Treasury in U.S.A., 1917-19, member, Anglo-French Financial Mission to U.S.A., 1918; Controller of Finance, Treasury, 1919-22; Finance Member, Viceroy's Executive Council, 1922-28; d. 1935.

executive authority which will have the effect of doing away with our most valued privileges and rights, just as was the case in the matter of the application of the Criminal Law Amendment Act. However, I will not go further into that question. All I need say is that the stages which are laid down in the Government of India Act or which have been contemplated by the rules are not the stages which are acceptable to the country at all. Sir Basil Blackett has referred to tracks, bridges and roads well used and well understood. May I ask Sir Basil Blackett if he can tell me whether any two nations have ever travelled along the same road for arriving at their freedom, and attaining full responsible government? Each nation, Sir, has gone its own way and, as my friend Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya put it, we, under the compelling necessity of the case, have chalked out a way for ourselves.

Then, there is the old question of the British Parliament being the sole Judge. I dealt with it in my opening remarks, and I shall not detain the House by repetition. But in regard to the Royal Commission which is contemplated by the Act, I will only say that a Royal Commission will not be acceptable. What we want is either a round table conference or a convention or something of that sort. As I said before, there is nothing in a name. You can give it any name you like. But a Royal Commission, we know what it is. There have been Royal Commissions before, and there is one in our midst at the present moment. What are the materials which the Royal Commission would put before the sole Judge, the British Parliament? It will take evidence. What will be that evidence? It will be official evidence and non-official evidence. One will cancel the other, and we shall remain where we are. We do not want it, Sir. We do not think any case has been made out, after the admission that there must be an advance, that the Royal Commission should come at a huge expenditure to explore the avenues of further advance. In fact, Sir, I think, so far as the British public and the British Parliament are concerned, my Honourable friend the Home Member and his colleagues with a few important personages out here and in England, if they so desire, can bring about a change in the viewpoint of Parliament, and they can, if they so desire, make Parliament see very differently to what it has been seeing so long. It is the persons who advise the Crown that count, and commissions and committees and conventions do not count with a House of Parliament 7,000 miles away, but they will count with us who are personally concerned.

Now, Sir, I am afraid I cannot deal with all that has been said about my amendment by the gentlemen who have preceded me, but I will say this that the offer my amendment makes is an offer made on the square without any mental reservation. It is for the Government to say whether they would accept it or not. It affords an opportunity, I submit, to the Government to right itself with the people, and to the people to right themselves with the Government. We know that in December 1921 the very thing I am asking for the Government was willing to grant—at least His Excellency the Viceroy was willing to give it to us if certain conditions had existed or rather if certain conditions had not existed. Well, those conditions do not exist now and I ask the Government whether the demand that is now put forward on behalf of the people is less opportune than it was in the year 1921 *minus* certain conditions which then existed. Now, Sir, this is an opportunity which I would



ward before this House as the minimum demand that we, as the representatives of the people, can put before the Government on their behalf. Now, Sir, some time ago, I made a note which by a happy accident I happened to turn up only yesterday. That was a note taken from Baring's<sup>1</sup> "Russia." It says:

"On the 30th October 1904 the Czar<sup>2</sup> promised, first, the creation of a deliberative and legislative Assembly without whose consent no new laws could be passed. Secondly, full rights of citizenship, the inviolability of the person, freedom of conscience, freedom of the press, the right of organising public meetings and founding associations."

That is at page 14 of Baring's "Russia". I have not got the book but my note shows that the passage occurs in the introduction. Then we find at page 123:

"Coupled with this free grant of the right, there was a retention, a reservation, of unlimited autocratic powers in the Czar and his Government."

We all know—it is a matter of history,—what happened after this. There were indiscriminate arrests and terrorism in the land. On a representation being made, what was the reply of the Czar? He said:

"The Emperor has not withdrawn anything he has given. He has merely not done what he never said he would do, namely, voluntarily abdicating his autocratic power."

Now, Sir, I do not for a moment mean to suggest that it was the intention or that there was the remotest idea of giving us a reply like this in the minds of those who framed the present Act or of anyone who was concerned with it in any degree. But, looking at it as a businessman, as a lawyer, as one accustomed to interpret language according to the meaning it can bear and not according to the pious purposes and objects which may have been in the minds of the person who used the language, I say that there is nothing to prevent the British Government or anyone on its behalf from saying that the power—the autocratic power—being there, you withdraw nothing that you have given. This power—if you do not like to call it autocratic, we will say the power of veto, the power to override, the power to undo all that we do—being there, you withdraw nothing and thus during the first stage both autocracy and reform go on working merrily together. That is the first stage of responsible government. Even at the last stage, I submit, if we follow this procedure, we shall, unless real responsibility is transferred to the hands of Indians, still be in the position in which we now are, and at any moment something may be done by His Excellency the Governor-General or by other

<sup>1</sup>Maurice Baring; b. 1874; journalist and author; member, Academic Committee and Fellow of the Royal Society of Literature; entered Diplomatic Service, 1898, Attaché to British Embassy in Paris, Copenhagen and Rome; was correspondent for *Morning Post* in Manchuria, 1904, Russia, 1905-08, Constantinople, 1909, for *Times* in the Balkans, 1912; d. 1945.

<sup>2</sup>Nicholas II; b. 1868, son of Alexander III; Czar of Russia, 1894-1917; his expansionist policy plunged Russia into a disastrous war with Japan, 1904-05; signed the Russo-German secret treaty, 1905; abdicated, 1917; d. 1918.

executive authority which will have the effect of doing away with our most valued privileges and rights, just as was the case in the matter of the application of the Criminal Law Amendment Act. However, I will not go further into that question. All I need say is that the stages which are laid down in the Government of India Act or which have been contemplated by the rules are not the stages which are acceptable to the country at all. Sir Basil Blackett has referred to tracks, bridges and roads well used and well understood. May I ask Sir Basil Blackett if he can tell me whether any two nations have ever travelled along the same road for arriving at their freedom, and attaining full responsible government? Each nation, Sir, has gone its own way and, as my friend Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya put it, we, under the compelling necessity of the case, have chalked out a way for ourselves.

Then, there is the old question of the British Parliament being the sole Judge. I dealt with it in my opening remarks, and I shall not detain the House by repetition. But in regard to the Royal Commission which is contemplated by the Act, I will only say that a Royal Commission will not be acceptable. What we want is either a round table conference or a convention or something of that sort. As I said before, there is nothing in a name. You can give it any name you like. But a Royal Commission, we know what it is. There have been Royal Commissions before, and there is one in our midst at the present moment. What are the materials which the Royal Commission would put before the sole Judge, the British Parliament? It will take evidence. What will be that evidence? It will be official evidence and non-official evidence. One will cancel the other, and we shall remain where we are. We do not want it, Sir. We do not think any case has been made out, after the admission that there must be an advance, that the Royal Commission should come at a huge expenditure to explore the avenues of further advance. In fact, Sir, I think, so far as the British public and the British Parliament are concerned, my Honourable friend the Home Member and his colleagues with a few important personages out here and in England, if they so desire, can bring about a change in the viewpoint of Parliament, and they can, if they so desire, make Parliament see very differently to what it has been seeing so long. It is the persons who advise the Crown that count, and commissions and committees and conventions do not count with a House of Parliament 7,000 miles away, but they will count with us who are personally concerned.

Now, Sir, I am afraid I cannot deal with all that has been said about my amendment by the gentlemen who have preceded me, but I will say this that the offer my amendment makes is an offer made on the square without any mental reservation. It is for the Government to say whether they would accept it or not. It affords an opportunity, I submit, to the Government to right itself with the people, and to the people to right themselves with the Government. We know that in December 1921 the very thing I am asking for the Government was willing to grant—at least His Excellency the Viceroy was willing to give it to us if certain conditions had existed or rather if certain conditions had not existed. Well, these conditions do not exist now and I ask the Government whether the demand that is now put forward on behalf of the people is less opportune than it was in the year 1921 *n inus* certain conditions which then existed. Now, Sir, this is an opportunity which I would

beg the Government Benches to bear in mind ought not to be thrown away. Opportunities like this do not occur every day. So far as we are concerned, Sir, we can but do what we have been doing. There is nothing else in our power. We cannot make you see things as we see them except by inviting you to give us a chance of explaining things to you and of having things explained to us. As I sat down to-day in my seat my Honourable friend Mr. Calvert<sup>1</sup> reminded me of the inevitable result of Swaraj. He said it would bring anarchy, and he cited the instances of Russia, China, Italy and other countries where there has been anarchy. (A Voice: "The same was the case with Australia and Bulgaria."). There may be a dozen other countries. But what I ask in all seriousness is: Are we pursuing the same methods for our Swaraj as those other countries did, which resulted in anarchy? Are we not merely asking you for a convention or a round table conference? Are we doing anything which is going to lead to anarchy or disorder of any kind? Is it not, Sir, the fact that, if there is anything in the world which is likely to restore old relations and to obliterate the sad memory of past events, it is the sort of conference which I suggest?

Then, as to the special interests. Every interest, as I have already submitted, will be fully represented. A conference is not a Parliament. It is not going to enact a law straight away which will affect British capital, or the Muhammadan interests or the interests of other minorities. Every minority will have the fullest opportunity of putting forward its case, and the Government itself will be the most important party to this conference. Those who say that they are safe in the hands of the Government and accept the guardianship of the Government for all time will have the guardians to look after their wards.

Then, as regards anarchy. There may be anarchy, if the present system of administration is continued and if our voice is not heard, or if the remedies—supposed remedies—which are now being adopted are continued to be adopted. You may talk of revolutionary crime. But what is that, Sir, except an outward symptom of the real disease. Treat the disease and not the symptom. And the only treatment, by far the best treatment, for the disease, is suggested, I submit, by my amendment. If this offer is spurned, then, as I have said, we can only depend upon ourselves. We have tried to obtain justice by means of so-called constitutional and proper ways but we have miserably failed. The one lesson that we have learnt is that we have to depend upon ourselves. Sir, we find ourselves in a position in which there is nothing for us but to follow the teachings of our faith and offer ourselves for a sacrifice to appease the wrath of the gods who have laid us low. But anarchy is not the thing for us.

Now, Sir, with your permission, I will say one word on the amendment of Dr. Gour. I find that he has now come here. The sole argument advanced by Dr. Gour against a re-election, against the new Legislature, is that you have

<sup>1</sup>Hubert Calvert; b. 1875; entered I.C.S., 1897. Registrar, Cooperative Societies, 1916-25; member, Punjab Legislative Council, 1923-24, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1924-26; Commissioner, Rawalpindi, 1926, member, Royal Commission on Agriculture, 1926-28; Financial Commissioner, Development, Punjab, 1929-33; Registrar, Cooperative Societies, Ceylon, 1935-36, d. 1961.

got so many uncertain elements in the case. First of all, he asks what is there to show that a round table conference would be a success, that we would come to a unanimous conclusion or decision in that conference. Then, he says, if we do come to a unanimous conclusion, what is there to show that the electorate will accept it and, if the electorate accepts it, what is there to show that this House will accept it. Then, finally my friend said: What is there to show that Parliament will accept it and pass the Statute in terms of the draft.

...  
Then the whole thing resolves itself into a personal equation. It is the trouble which my friend will have of standing for two more elections. (Laughter) Now, I do appeal to the patriotism of Honourable Members and request them to discard the personal element altogether. We know from our personal experience that it is most troublesome to contest a general election and, if it were only possible to maintain the principle of my amendment, I would have been glad indeed, Sir, to delete clause (b) to satisfy my friend Dr. Gour and others who do not like to risk a general election again, or perhaps two general elections. But, without clause (b) of my amendment, the very reason for it disappears; the very principle upon which it is based is entirely eliminated. I say that no Swarajist can agree to delete that clause without committing a serious breach of faith with his constituency. He has been elected and offered himself to his constituency as a Swarajist, as one who was going to secure Swaraj according to the wishes of the people. My friend, Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal, yesterday said that the Swaraj he was looking for was the Swaraj of the poor man, the poorest man. I am in entire agreement with my friend. But are not the persons whose Swaraj we are striving for entitled to have a say in the matter? So far as we, Congressmen, are concerned, I repeat again that it will be nothing but a breach of faith on our part to arrogate to ourselves the privilege of framing a constitution for all our countrymen outside this House. Then my friends say that we are representatives of the people who have sent us here. I say, so we are. But we have come here for a definite purpose. And we must not in all honour do a thing which really amounts to trespassing upon the rights and privileges of the people. I do not think there is any public man either in this House or outside it who has ever said that the Swaraj that he wanted was any other than the Swaraj of the people. You will remember, Sir, most Honourable Members will remember, that, when asked by the Anglo-Indian press, and by other critics, times out of number, to define what he meant by Swaraj, Mr. Gandhi refused to do so. He said:

"It is not for me, it is not for anyone to say that. It is for the people to say what is the form of Government they are going to have."

And, if I am not mistaken—I am sorry I have not got the extract here—in his Cambridge speech, I think Mr. Montagu said that all these transitional stages are meant as experiments, and that the real form of Government no one can determine except the Indian people themselves, according to their genius and according to their traditions. Now, Sir, it is that form of Government which my amendment asks to be established in this country and I submit that no one is a better judge of that form than the people themselves. We cannot, therefore, arrogate to ourselves an authority which we do not possess.

And now one word, Sir, in regard to the doubts of some of my Muhammadan friends about the communal proportions there will be in the representation at the round table conference to begin with and then in the Legislature which is to be elected, and afterwards in the administration of the country. Well, I can only say that these are the very questions for which I have asked for a round table conference or a convention. Honourable members who have such doubts will do well to read the Report of the Irish Convention. I was looking into it yesterday. I have a copy with me and I can lend it to them. They will find that in Ireland, although the nature of the differences was not the same as here, the number or the intensity of the differences was not less than we see prevailing here at this hour. And yet, while those differences existed, while there were the Ulster Unionists, the Southern Unionists, the Nationalists, and Labourites, all separated, as far apart as the poles, they all came together in the Convention. It was not once but more than a dozen times that they came to the breaking point, and it was only by the statesmanship of the British Cabinet and of the Irish patriots who were engaged in the Convention that all crises were passed over. They ended at last by arriving at certain conclusions which were afterwards adopted in a Statute of Parliament. I simply invite them to do the same,—no one will commit himself in the least to anything by agreeing to this. I invite all interests, all minorities and all individuals to come and join us in a Convention and think out our own salvation for ourselves.

#### *274 Greetings of the Assembly to the Labour Party, 14 February 1924<sup>1</sup>*

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, after a long and bravely sustained struggle, the Labour Party has come into power for the first time in the Parliamentary history of England. It has lived through good and evil report, always standing for greater freedom, greater justice to humanity at large and perfect equality between man and man. The success of the Labour Party in England is the success of these noble principles and carries with it hope and encouragement to all who love their own freedom and are striving to attain it at any cost. The members of the Swaraj Party are therefore glad to join the Honourable Mover of this Resolution in his desire to convey the greetings of the House to the Labour Party on its advent to power.

There can be little in common between a party of free Englishmen and the Swaraj Party formed by a people held in subjection by free England. The former started under a constitution which has made it possible for an engine cleaner to be a Minister of the Crown and a cabin boy to rise to the exalted position of the Viceroy of India. The latter has yet to secure for the people of India the most elementary rights of citizenship. But the Labour Party and specially some of the "wild men" in it have in the past stood forth as staunch friends of India, and India, ever ready to grasp the hand of fellowship extended to it, has loved and honoured them in return. Many of us in this House enjoy the personal friendship of some of the wild as well as the sober men of

<sup>1</sup>*The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. IV Part I, 30th January, 1924 to 18th February, 1924, Delhi, 1924, pp. 650-51.*

the Party, and it is but natural for us to offer them our sincere congratulations on their success. We note with regret that the leader of this great Party which is committed to the principle of the right of self-determination for all nations, great and small, should immediately before taking charge of his high office have thought it necessary to sound a note of warning to us for claiming that very right. But we have not forgotten what he said in April 1918. In a private letter intended for publication and recently published in the press he said:

"In my opinion Home Rule for India has now become inevitable. The British administration of your country has its logical and necessary outcome in your own self-government. In ordinary times that would have been long postponed, but the circumstances of your country have so changed as to make it wise and politic. The War has hastened this evolution and has suddenly brought the country face to face with its ultimate duties. We must trust India just as we must trust Ireland. We must allow India to develop a culture of its own. We must lay on the Indian people both the burdens and responsibilities and make them the custodians of their own welfare. I would therefore give them not merely a minimum measure but a generous one. Whatever form the governing machinery may take, two things must be granted. In the first place, the Viceroy's Council must be of the nature of a Cabinet and must be responsible to the representative authorities. In the second place, India must have control of her own finances. I hope that broad-minded wisdom is to assist both of us to arrive at a happy conclusion."

We can only hope that this broad-minded wisdom will be brought to bear upon the demand that we have put forward. Meanwhile, Sir, in the words of Abraham Lincoln:

"With malice towards none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, we strive on to finish the work we are in."

Sir, I beg to support the motion on behalf of the Swaraj Party.

*275. Grant of Full Self-Governing Dominion Status to India, 18 February 1924<sup>1</sup>*

Pandit Motilal Nehru: May I make a personal explanation? The Swaraj Party still stands and will always stand for what it said in that manifesto. I do not admit that that manifesto is in any way inconsistent with the amendment which I have proposed to the Resolution of my friend Mr. Rangachariar. But whatever the Swaraj Party may say outside, and whatever its future intentions may be, after this Government has given its decision, with regard to its own course of conduct, that is entirely beside the question. The only issue now before the House is whether this Resolution or the amendment which I have put before the House commends itself to it or not, not what the Swaraj Party may do or what it may feel.

...  
I have repeated the same statement in my speech, if the Honourable Member will remember.

...  
Call it what you like—responsible government or self-government.

...  
I did not say that at all. I want to make it clear that the position of the Swaraj Party outside this Assembly has nothing whatever to do with the amendment which is now before the House. The Swaraj Party stands for what it has always stood, and I do hope and trust that it will continue to stand for it. But this, as I pointed out in my speech, is an amendment considerably toned down to meet the wishes of friends who were not prepared to go as far as the Swaraj Party. The amendment is before the House and it is for the House to give its opinion upon the amendment.

...  
That we shall see.

...  
And at the speeches here, not outside.

#### 276. *Muhammadan Representation, 19 February 1924*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, my Honourable friend, Mr. Kabeerud-Din Ahmed<sup>2</sup>, has referred to me in such generous terms in his speech that I feel it is my duty to take my humble part in the debate. Sir, it was only yesterday that we passed the Resolution on responsible government with a great and decisive majority. That Resolution affirmed the view that the best course to be adopted to protect the rights of important minorities was our assembling together at a round table conference, and that was taken to be the best means of adjusting our differences. It was understood that that Resolution covered the very ground which is covered by the Resolution of my Honourable friend to-day, and the passing of that Resolution, I submit, means that the House considers a round table conference to be the most effective means of settling all communal differences which have arisen, or may arise between the various communities of India. Now, Sir, it is, I submit, putting the House in a very awkward position to bring forward the motion which my learned friend has done, after the passing of that Resolution. The House, in my humble opinion, would stultify itself by entering into the merits of one of the very questions which it specifically reserved for the consideration of a round table conference. I must frankly tell my friend that we shall have no option but to vote against the Resolution if it goes to a division, not because we are not in full sympathy with the Honourable Mover, not because we think that it is not a most important matter which requires our immediate attention, but because, Sir, we have already agreed that a round

<sup>1</sup>*The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. IV, Part II, 19th February, 1924 to 12th March, 1924, Delhi, 1924, pp. 783-85.*

<sup>2</sup>Kabeer-ud-Din Ahmed; b. 1886; advocate, Calcutta High Court, member, Bengal Legislative Council, 1920, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1921-34, Democratic Party in the Assembly, 1921-24, founder of Parliamentary Muslim Party in the Legislative Assembly, 1925, and also its Chief Whip, member, Royal Commission on Labour, 1929; d. 1939.

table conference is much the better way of dealing with the questions. My Honourable friend need have no fear because the Government gave a very unsatisfactory response to the Resolution of yesterday. I can assure him that the round table conference to consider this question which he has raised, if not any other questions, is coming in spite of the Government. We have given the Government a full opportunity to do the right thing at the right moment. If the Government will not avail themselves of that opportunity, my friend knows that we have a way of doing the right thing independently of the Government, and I can assure him that we are bent upon doing that right thing by our Muhammadan friends. (Mr. K. Ahmed: "If the Government does not distribute the seats?") That round table conference, as I was saying, is going to take place at an early date, and I am quite hopeful; nay, indeed, I am absolutely certain that it is going to decide these questions so far at least as they come in the way of our attaining Swaraj.

My friend himself—my friend the learned Mover and my Honourable friend, Mr. Duraiswami Aiyangar—then referred to the last message of Mahatma Gandhi. That, the House will observe, makes it perfectly clear that Mahatmaji is going to make it the sole work of his life to bring Hindus and Muhammadans together to settle their differences and to see that they live like friendly neighbours as they ought to.

I thought he referred to his last message; I stand corrected. If that was the message, in his latest message in the letter which my friend has read addressed to Maulana Mahomed Ali he has said that he is not going to rest until he had done all he could to bring about perfect harmony and sympathy between Hindus and Muhammadans and the various communities of India. Now, Sir, I was going to say we know that many great men have before this tried to solve the question of communal differences in the country, but as I have said before on another occasion, it was given to Mahatma Gandhi alone to bring the roaring lion of Islam and the gentle cow of Hinduism to lie down side by side in peace and harmony. There was, I admit, far too short a time; but I fully believe that, if his era of usefulness had not been interrupted by incarceration, Hindu-Moslem unity to-day would have been an accomplished fact and a lasting fact. However, Sir, we are concerned more with what is and not with what might have been, and as to that I can only give my friend an assurance that we shall make an honest and sincere and a strong effort to meet his wishes and to afford the amplest protection to all the minorities of India including the Muhammadans. Now, Sir, I am but a humble individual by birth, and by belief a Hindu—a belief as unshakable as that of any other Hindu; but I yield to none in my admiration of the religion and culture of Islam. As was the custom in the particular class of Brahmans from which I come, in the days of my boyhood my earliest education was in a Muhammadan *maqtab*. My earliest impressions were received at the feet of Muhammadan professors and teachers and the more than half a century that has since elapsed has not, I can assure my Muhammadan friends here, in the least blunted the effect which those first impressions produced upon my young mind. Indeed, Sir, I think I may with some confidence say that I have not ever said or done anything that can be taken in the least degree to affect that



high conception which I formed at an earlier stage of my life, and as a sincere friend of my Muhammadan countrymen I assure them that their claims will receive the greatest and most careful attention at the hands of the conference which will be convened by ourselves in the absence of any sympathy being shown by the Government; and on those grounds I will ask my friend to withdraw his Resolution, because if he does not, as I have said he is placing us in a most awkward position—a position which will not be cleared by the voting upon it. My friend, Mr. Duraiswami Aiyangar has given his hearty support to the Resolution of the Honourable Mover. Now, Sir, I followed his speech very carefully but I found that all that he meant and all that he said was that the principle involved in the Resolution, namely, the effect it would have in bringing about Hindu-Muhammadan unity, has his fullest support. He did not enter into the merits of the various percentages with which the Resolution deals, and indeed if my friend will pardon my saying so, coming from the Presidency of Madras as he does, he is not aware of the importance of these percentages. He does not know what the real causes of the differences between the Hindus and Muhammadans of Upper India are; and really it is these differences between the Hindus and Muhammadans of Upper India which are causing us all the inconvenience and all the trouble that we are experiencing. Indeed, as my friend, Mr. Muhammad Yakub, just informed the House, and he is as good a Muhammadan and he claims to be a better Muhammadan than the Honourable Mover—he comes from the United Provinces and as a Muhammadan he differs from the principle of this Resolution. So there are many intricate points involved in it. It will not do for this House to enter—this House is incapable of entering—into those intricacies, and indeed the one great reason why I ask my friend to withdraw his Resolution is that the Government is the last person in the world to go to in determining a question like that. You can only determine it by deciding it for yourselves. If you cannot decide it, then it will remain undecided. The Government have no say in the matter at all. What have the Government done so far? There was my friend, Mr. Muhammed Yakub, who said that the Government had not passed any legislation trying to remove these things. Well, in that I beg to differ from my Honourable friend. The Government could not, and if they did, it would not have removed these differences. The only means of removing these differences is to arrive at an understanding between ourselves, and that is the understanding which has been suggested in the Resolution which I submit has been adopted yesterday by the House. In view of all these things I beg my Honourable friend to withdraw his Resolution.

277. *Return to India of B.G. Horniman, 19 February 1924*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru: I rise only to say one word lest my silence on this occasion should be misconstrued and that word is that I fully associate myself

<sup>1</sup> *The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. IV, Part II, 19th February, 1924 to 12th March, 1924, Delhi, 1924, pp. 813, 815.*

with the Resolution which has been moved by my Honourable friend Mr. Patel. This morning I had a conference with my friend and we both thought that this was a Resolution which would not take more than a quarter of an hour in this House. We tried our best to discover what the Government could possibly say in answer to the demand which was contained in that Resolution. I confess, Sir, that, used as I am to anticipate various arguments, I wholly failed to carry my mind into the channels in which the mind of the Honourable the Home Member has travelled. I heard his speech and what do I find? He declined to go into the merits of the case. He says that this is not the proper tribunal for it. But he gives his decisions and he says, "we hold by those decisions." Then he says, "if we take a different view we shall change our mind and we shall allow him to come." The House was kept absolutely in the dark as to what those reasons may be. Mr. Horniman is a dangerous character. Mr. Horniman has insulted the dignity of the Government. These are grave, yet very vague, charges which no human being can answer. Then, when a series of allegations were made by other speakers in the House and specially by my friend, Mr. Jamnadas, the Honourable the Home Member got up and said it is not true that that was one of those allegations. So it comes to this, that the Government in depriving a man and an Englishman of his liberty have not the courage to come into the open and state the charge upon which they have deported him and they resort to a process of inanity. They hate other people coming forward with what conceivable charges may possibly have been in the mind of the Government and as to one of them they say 'it is not true'. That is a process of reasoning which I have for the first time in my life come across on the floor of this House to-day. What is there to prevent the Government now, after five years have elapsed after the deportation of Mr. Horniman, saying, what it was that he had done which merited the sentence which was passed upon him, which merited the punishment from which he is now suffering. Is it not in the public interest to divulge that? If there is anything criminal in it, why not prosecute him? I cannot conceive of a charge which cannot be uttered, which cannot be proved and yet of such a grave and serious nature that you feel yourself compelled to deprive one of your own compatriots of his liberty and keep him confined in England and rob him of all freedom of movement and of visiting any place he likes. Sir, I need not go into any other arguments. All I need say is that the case made out for the removal of the restraints which still continue against Mr. Horniman is an irresistible one. It is an unanswerable one and one which has not been answered and not even attempted to be answered by the Honourable Member. I therefore wholly associate myself with this Resolution.

On a point of order, Sir. What has the fact that Mr. Chaman Lall was the dummy editor while he was the real editor got to do at all with Mr. Horniman, or with the reasons for the deportation of Mr. Horniman or with the continuance of the restraint.

278. *The Budget—List of Demands, 10 March 1924*

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, the point of order raised by my Honourable friend would, I think, be sufficiently answered by the terms of paragraph 131 of the Legislative Assembly Manual of Business and Procedure, which reproduces Rule 48. That paragraph runs as follows:

"No motion for appropriation can be made except on the recommendation of the Governor General communicated to the Assembly.

(2) Motions may be moved at this stage."

—this stage being the stage of voting on Demands for Grants—

"to omit or reduce any grant, but not to increase or alter the destination of a grant."

I submit that my motion is a motion to omit the grant and it comes quite clearly within sub-clause (2) of clause 131 of this Manual. As for the difficulty as regards the reduction of the grant by Rs 100 preceding my motion for the omission of the whole grant, that, I submit, is a question for you. It is for you, Sir, to arrange the order in which these various amendments shall be put to the House. If my motion was in time and proper, my right to move it cannot be affected simply because the printer has chosen to print it as No. 2 and not as No. 1.

...  
That is a matter which I leave in the hands of the Chair.

...  
Sir, I am not in a position to say what the sense of the House is as to whether the motion which stands in my name should be taken up first or the other motions which merely propose reductions by small sums. But I would like you, Sir, to throw some more light upon the observation you just made which I understood to mean that on this grant and at this stage you will not allow a discussion except on points referring to the grant itself. (Several Honourable Members: "No, no; that is the other way".)

...  
Sir, I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head Customs be omitted."

I thank you, Sir, for the opportunity you have accorded to me at this early stage of the debate to address the House on this motion. It is necessary for me at the very outset to explain the exact meaning and scope of the motion. I have to thank you, Sir, that you have in your preliminary remarks clarified the position so far as the principle upon which I base my motion is concerned. I may at once concede that it has nothing whatever to do with any criticism of the various items that are included in this demand nor with any grievance which may be connected with any particular branch of the Customs Department. I have no doubt that those who have studied the Budget and its various heads will be able to point to a number of items which should either be omitted, being such as should never have found a place in the Budget, or which, if they are allowed to remain there, should be very considerably, reduced. I confess that I have not studied the whole Budget or this head parti-

cularly from that point of view, but I may, in passing, mention that there is one item which cannot escape the notice of even a cursory observer who turns over the pages, and that is the item of the excise duty on cotton. I do not, however, as I have already submitted, rely upon that or any particular item or put my case upon any grievance which may arise under it. To put it . . . [briefly], Sir, I propose on general grounds to refuse to vote money for the needs of the Government of India. My grievance is not against this or that branch of the administration but against the entire administration of the Government of India. I have selected Customs simply because it happens to be the first item on the list of grants.

Now, Sir, why is it that I make a grievance against the entire system of administration of the Government of India? The reason will be apparent to the minds of the House. It is . . . [neither] more nor less than the very unsatisfactory nature of the response which has been made to the Resolution which this House passed by a large majority last month on the subject of the establishment of responsible government in India. I say that I am perfectly entitled, Sir, to stand on this ground, and I may at once inform the House, especially some of the more nervous Members of it, that it has nothing whatever to do with what has been described as the wrecking or destroying policy of the non-co-operators. It is a perfectly constitutional and legitimate means of bringing a very serious grievance to the notice of the Government, and, when other remedies have failed, it is the only course open to people who have outstanding grievances. I wish here to point out to the House that I am using nothing which is by any means the special property of the non-co-operator. I am indeed doing nothing new as will appear from the following paragraph in Taswell-Langmead's<sup>1</sup> *English Constitutional History*, which deals with this matter. It is to be found on page 290 and runs:

"The dependence of supplies on the redress of grievances originated under Richard II<sup>2</sup>. It had previously been usual for the king not to answer petitions until the last day of the session, when the supplies had of course been granted. The attempt to invert this order of proceeding had been declared by Richard II's judges to be high treason. But in the . . . [reign] of Henry IV<sup>3</sup> the Commons again endeavoured to secure this important lever for the application of parliamentary power. The king resisted firmly, and the commons gave way for the time, but the practice gradually gained ground."

Now I wish particularly that Honourable Members will bear clearly in mind the difference between the effect of a motion of this character when it is raised in a free House, in a House to which the Executive Government is responsible, and when it is raised in a House like this in which the Executive

<sup>1</sup>Thomas Pitts Taswell-Langmead; b. 1840; educated at Kings' College, London and St. Mary Hall, Oxford; Professor of Constitutional History and Law in University College, London, 1882; author of *The Reign of Richard the Second, English Constitutional History from the Teutonic Conquest to the Present Time*, 1875; d. 1882.

<sup>2</sup>Richard II, b. 1367, succeeded his grandfather Edward III as King of England in 1377; assumed control of government, 1389; deposed by Parliament, captured and imprisoned by Henry IV, 1399; d. 1400.

<sup>3</sup>Henry of Bolingbroke, later Henry IV; b. 1367; wrested crown from Richard II; formally acclaimed King of England, 1399; d. 1413.

Government has the serene satisfaction of doing what it pleases, whatever we may say or we may do. It is important to understand the exact nature and effect of such a motion as it varies with the powers of the House in which it is made. To show what it is in England, I would here beg permission to quote from the English translation of the book entitled "The Budget", originally written in French by Rene Stourm, which is a standard book on the subject. I read from page 385. This is what Fox<sup>1</sup> said in the House of Commons on February 20th, 1784, in the course of his long continued controversy with Pitt<sup>2</sup>, with which the House will be familiar as a matter of history:

"It cannot be contested that the Constitution gives to the House the right to refuse the funds; but this is a weapon which the House must use with caution and only when the public cause imperatively demands such action. I shall always uphold this right... This is a struggle between the prerogatives of the Crown and the prerogatives of representatives of the people. The Chamber should use all the means within its powers to defend these privileges; this is a duty which the Constitution imposes upon the House. To withhold the demanded funds is the most powerful of all weapons, and must, I admit, be used in the last resort. If the ministers should persist in their obstinacy and push things to the extreme, it would be perfectly proper to use this right which makes the distinction between a free people and the slaves of an absolute monarchy."

Now, I beg Honourable Members to bear clearly in mind the distinction pointed out here between a "free people" and the "slaves of an absolute monarchy." In the case of a free people, what are the consequences that follow a motion of this kind, if it is allowed? Here they are—at page 381:

"To refuse to vote the budget! One can scarcely conceive the consequences of such an eventuality. If the year were to open without the budget having been voted, the bondholders could not get their interest! nor the pensioners their pensions; the tradesmen would beat in vain at the gates of the Treasury; the officials would work without salaries; the schools would be closed; the Army would be deprived of its pay, of its livelihood, of its equipment, of its provisions. All the functionaries of the State, that is to say practically everybody, would find himself affected; the activities of the country would be paralyzed."

That, Sir, is the result of a vote on a motion of this kind being carried in a free country and in a House where the Legislature has an Executive sub-ordinate to it. But what are the consequences here? Instead, as described here, of the tradesmen beating in vain at the gates of the Treasury, all that can happen after we have passed this Resolution is that tradesmen and others will only beat their own heads instead of beating at the gates of the Treasury when

<sup>1</sup>Charles James Fox; b. 1749, member, British Parliament, 1768, 1780, Foreign Secretary, 1782-83, 1806; introduced India Reform Bill in 1783 to reform the administration of the East India Company; took a leading part in the impeachment of Warren Hastings; d. 1806

<sup>2</sup>William Pitt; b. 1759; known as Pitt the Younger; statesman; called to the bar in 1780; elected to British Parliament in 1781; became Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1782 and Prime Minister in 1783; d. 1806.

the Demand is restored. I may be allowed to read another little extract which shows that, even when grave consequences follow in free countries, it is the incumbent duty of the representatives of the people to resort to the motion and to carry it notwithstanding all these consequences, if the nature of the grievance justifies it. This is at page 389 of the same book and is taken from the debate in the French Chamber of Deputies.

"Perfectly independent legislators, imbued with the feeling of the sanctity of their duties, should not be afraid to refuse to vote the Budgets if the latter fail to give them the desired guarantees against abuses. Nothing is less surprising than the fact that individuals in power are of a different opinion and that they fear [that] such procedures are likely to over-turn the State. .but that individuals, who take no part in the plunder, should consider this useful firmness a dangerous extremity, is a sign of weakness which protects extravagance and corruption and is an accomplice to the downfall of governments!"

I need not give any more extracts. I may mention that, since the year 1784, it is stated in this book that such a motion has never been made in England. And why? Because the occasion never arose to make such a motion. The development of the constitution made it impossible for the Government in power to resist the will of the people even for one second, to say nothing for a longer time. The right is still there, but it is a right which has been correctly described as a weapon lying rusting in the armoury of the constitution. That is so in England. We here, if we are to do our duty in this House, have not to take out a rusty weapon from the armoury but to forge one clean and burnished and get familiar with its use to protect the rights of the people whom we represent after acquiring the power to do so. For the present what is the effect? The highest that it can be put at is that it will amount to a strong protest—as strong as this House can make—against the action we complain of. The helplessness of the representatives of the people cannot be better illustrated than by the discussion of the Budget in this House. We assembled last week in this Chamber in all seriousness as representatives of the people to consider demands approximating nearly 150 crores—more accurately Rs 131 and odd crores—as if we were going to apply this huge sum for the benefit of the people and in doing so were exercising our independent judgement. But, we were only doing something like what children playing at soldiers do. There were all the parliamentary forms; there were all the parliamentary paraphernalia; there were the formalities and the conventionalities; but what was the substance? Where did the substance lie? Had we at any time in the course of the discussion, or have we to-day, any real control over the most insignificant item entered in this Budget? Of course we can have our say and after we have had our say, it will be for His Excellency the Governor General to consider what is essential for the administration and what is not, and whatever is essential he will certify. Now, Honourable Members will remember that, when this Budget was introduced by my Honourable friend the Finance Member

the words of Lord Olivier<sup>1</sup> were ringing in our ears. They were first heard over the cables in a Reuter's message, rather disjointed and in sections, and, when they were so heard, they sent a cold wave throughout the country. That wave has now passed away. The fragments of that long message have now been pieced together. They have been considered by the country and the incessant cry from every quarter of India is "throw out the 'Budget'". And why? Because the response made in the House of Lords is totally unsatisfactory and disappointing. Well, as I have said, we cannot really throw out the Budget but we must do what we can and we have been allowed an opportunity to do what we can by raising a debate in respect of this item. What I say is this. It is not, as Lord Olivier puts it, that we, like cross children, say, "we will not play." The real fact is that we refuse to play an unfair game in which both sides do not occupy an equal footing and equal advantages. We took the earliest opportunity of saying in this House that we cannot join in it until you revise the rules of the game. The rules have not been revised. No immediate or early prospect of a revision of the rules is held out. What is said is, "we will see if we cannot within these rules find something which would make the actual play fair to you and fair to us." That was the reply given in this House by my Honourable friend, the Home Member. When the cable from England arrived, after a good deal of expectation and the building of many castles in the air, it turned out that Lord Olivier was not prepared to go any further, or advance the case any further at all than what my Honourable friend, the Home Member, had done in his speech in this House. That response, I submit, has been considered by the country at large as not only insufficient but highly unsatisfactory and disappointing.

Now, what are the grounds of our dissatisfaction with that response? Sir, my first complaint is that the the position has not been correctly appreciated by the Secretary of State for India. He has brushed aside serious grievances lightly and has come to the conclusion that the distrust which undoubtedly exists in this country is due to "mistaken belief, ill-informed belief and ill-inferred belief", the belief here referred to being that expressed in the manifesto of the Swaraj Party—I am not referring to it as anything special to the Swaraj Party, but because the Secretary of State has chosen to refer to that document. I do not identify the House, I do not wish to identify the House, with anything that is contained in that document, but I think I can without fear of contradiction say that the sentiments expressed in that document are not sentiments peculiar to the Swarajists alone. They are sentiments which have been expressed almost from every platform, by men of every shade of opinion. Only yesterday when I was looking through the proceedings of this House for the last year I found that the same sentiments were expressed on the floor of this House by my Honourable friend, Mr. T. Rangachariar, when he moved a similar motion. Although the belief which engenders the distrust in us is described by the Secretary of State as a "mistaken belief, . . . ill-

<sup>1</sup>Sydney Olivier, b. 1859; Governor, Jamaica, 1907-13; Permanent Secretary to the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, 1913-17; Assistant Comptroller and Auditor of Exchequer, 1917; Secretary of State for India, 1924; Chairman, West Indian Sugar Commission, 1929-30; d. 1943.

informed belief and ill-inferred belief," we find that His Lordship with some inconsistency admits that there are things which do rankle very generally in our minds. That, I submit, is due to the fact that His Lordship has not probed our wounds deeper. I do not blame His Lordship for not doing so. He could, after all, only have the materials supplied by the Government of India to go upon and it may be that his materials were not so full as they ought to have been. I need not go at any length into the omissions to be noticed in the important statement made by the Secretary of State, but I shall just only mention a few which show that he was far from a correct appreciation of the situation as it obtains in India probably because the materials before him were insufficient. But before I mention those omissions, I desire to express my appreciation, and I hope it will be shared by the House, of the extremely fair and courageous criticism of the Secretary of State of some of the incidents dealt with by him: notably, the exploits of General Dyer, the famous "steel frame" speech, the popular feeling against the certification of the salt tax—the effect of which I am sorry has been minimised by a subsequent explanation—the very sympathetic treatment of the Kenya question, and the courageous declaration in regard to the release of Mahatma Gandhi. As the House is aware, the Government of India and the Government of Bombay in doing the right thing have robbed it of all the grace that there was in it by assigning a particular reason, namely, his serious illness. Lord Olivier, less obsessed by the fetish of prestige, has now declared clearly that it was repugnant to human feeling that a man of his character, referring to Mr. Gandhi, should be treated as a criminal. Speaking for myself, Sir, I recognise and acknowledge this graceful admission and I think it does to a certain extent, if not totally, remove the sting involved in the order of release.

To mention only some of the most important things that have been omitted from the consideration of His Lordship, I would first mention the Rowlatt Act, that disgraceful piece of legislation which was described by Mahatma Gandhi as "an unmistakable symptom of deep-rooted disease in the governing body." That, Sir, coming after a chain of events, was really the last straw and the cause of precipitating the trouble. It would have been fair to Lord Olivier as well as to ourselves if he had been fully informed of the people's determined stand against that legislation, if he had also been informed of the indiscriminate oppression and repression which were resorted to and which afterwards led to many a disturbance of the peace and the loss of many an innocent life. All those violent measures were resorted to suppress the national outburst of feeling and not to check any organised crime or rebellion. Then, again, the campaign of repression which followed the application of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, I thought also had something to do with the present situation, but we find no mention of it in Lord Olivier's statement which professed to go into the causes of the prevailing mistrust. Then as to the Sikh trouble, no account of the Sikhs and recent events in their history can possibly be complete without a full description of the horrors committed in Guru Ka Bagh; but there is no reference to it in Lord Olivier's speech. If there is one thing more than another which has exasperated our Sikh brethren, it is the doings of the authorities at Guru Ka Bagh. I therefore submit that



the inference of His Lordship the Secretary of State is justified, if it can be justified, more by his desire not to offend the Government of India than by his promises, because, as I have stated, he admits, even upon the facts submitted to him, that there are things which do naturally rankle in our minds and which ought to rankle in the minds of all human beings similarly situated. If His Lordship had gone deeper into the history of the Indian unrest, he would have found that the movement of non-co-operation was not a new movement never thought of before the year 1919. The unrest is a chronic disease more deep-seated than Lord Olivier has taken it to be and for that I beg to draw the attention of this House to what that far-sighted statesman, Gokhale, said in 1905 when there was no idea of starting a movement of this kind. He said on that occasion, I think it was in the Congress, when he was dealing with the question of the partition of Bengal:

"If the opinions of such men are to be brushed aside with contempt, if all Indians are to be treated as no better than dumb driven cattle, if men whom other countries would delight to honour are to be led to realise the utter humiliation and helplessness of their position in their own country, then all I can say is 'good-bye to all hopes of co-operating in any way with the bureaucracy in the interests of the people'. I can conceive of no greater indictment of the British rule than that such a state of things should be possible after a hundred years of that rule."

Four years later, in 1909, he expressed the same sentiment on the question of the Indians in South Africa, when he said:

"What is the passive resistance struggle? It is essentially defensive in its nature and it fights with moral and spiritual weapons. The passive resister resists tyranny by undergoing suffering in his own person. He pitches soul force against brute force, he pitches the divine in man against the brute in man. He pitches suffering against oppression, he pitches conscience against might, he pitches faith against injustice, right against wrong."

The result of what I have submitted so far is that our first grievance is that His Lordship the Secretary of State has not correctly appreciated the extent of our grievances and the real depth of our open wounds. Now I come to the response that he has made. I will not detain the House at any great length but I will take what the Honourable the Home Member said in this House as representing really the gist of what His Lordship stated in the House of Lords, because we have it from both these high authorities that the statement in this House was made with the full concurrence of His Majesty's Government. What my Honourable friend the Home Member said here was in effect that there could be no present revision of the Government of India Act but that the purpose of the Government was high. Now, Sir, so far as that is concerned we take it as a refusal of the demand which was put in the form of a Resolution of the House, and our frank reply to that part of it which says that the purpose of the Government is high is that we have long since ceased to be satisfied with mere declarations of purposes, however high, unless they are accompanied by action. His Lordship the Secretary of State adopted the same line though in far more conciliatory language. He in effect says "we are willing to do everything for you. We are new. Let us settle

down. We are trying to discover points of contact." I have not omitted to consider very carefully the important concluding words of his speech, expressing His Lordship's hope to discover these points of contact with the least avoidable delay. But what does all that come to? I submit it does not come to anything more than this: Here is a patient bleeding to death but the surgeon says "I am pre-occupied. I must take my own time to get ready to stop the bleeding." Now, Sir, it must not be taken that I have not fully appreciated and am not thankful to Lord Olivier for the very conciliatory language he has used. It is not a case of our being reminded, as was done some time ago in the House of Commons, that the British people were the most determined people in the world and that whatever representations we may make they would not change their intentions as regards the Government of India Act or the granting of responsible government of India. I am very glad that that tone has not been adopted by His Lordship the Secretary of State. In passing, I may say that I for one fully concede the claim made by Mr. Montagu on behalf of the British people; but, if that claim is to be judged by what is happening in India, I say frankly that I do not envy the kind of determination which it implies. It implies a determination to withhold the rights of the people, or at least to postpone their grant indefinitely. While admitting it to be a fact that the British are a very determined people, I may be allowed humbly to suggest that determination is not the sole heritage of Britishers, and that it is a human quality, more human in those who stand upon their rights than in those who withhold the rights of others. But, as I have said, I appreciate the tone of His Lordship the present Secretary of State's response to us. I wish that sweet words could remove grievances. We have the misfortune of knowing and feeling things of which probably the Secretary of State is not even aware. For the rest, His Lordship's statement only draws attention to the difficulties of the situation. We all recognize that, but my submission is that the very moderate and modest demand that was put to the Government in the Resolution of this House would have been the most proper way of meeting the exigencies of the whole situation. It has not been given a fair consideration either here or in England. But I again, in order to avoid any misunderstanding, acknowledge the change in the angle of vision, if I may use a well-known phrase, which is apparent in His Lordship's statement. At the same time, Sir, I feel bound to draw attention to the extreme urgency of the case and to the fact that the line of action foreshadowed by the Government of India and His Majesty's Government is wholly unacceptable to the country and therefore to us as representatives of the country. His Lordship has compared the present Government of India Act to a seaworthy vessel, and he says that it ought to carry us across if we get into it and row. My only answer to that is that it may be a seaworthy vessel but what we want is not only a seaworthy vessel but a vessel big enough for our cargo, large enough to accommodate the millions of passengers that have to cross over from servility to freedom. For that purpose the vessel is not at all fitted. Sir, the other day I quoted in another connection from a published letter of the present Prime Minister, and, before sitting down, I only wish to remind the Right Honourable the Prime Minister of the last sentence of that letter which

runs thus:

"Whatever form the governing machinery may take, two things must be granted. In the first place the Viceroy's Council must be of the nature of a Cabinet and must be responsible to the representative authorities. In the second place India must have control of her own finances. I hope that broad-minded wisdom is to assist both of us to arrive at a happy conclusion."

I submit, Sir, that it is now time for the Labour Government to deliver the goods, and I maintain that we are perfectly entitled to withhold the payment of the price until the goods are delivered. We mean nothing more by passing this Resolution, because, as I have said, it does not amount really to an actual refusal of supplies. We, in this imitation Parliament are doing something in imitation of the real right of the people's representatives. This has only one result, namely, to bring it to the notice of the Government that, so far as we are concerned, we have taken the strongest possible step that was open to us. It may be our misfortune but it is not our fault that it falls flat and we cannot give effect to the motion as it is given effect to under the rules which prevail in free countries.

In conclusion, Sir, I would appeal to the Honourable Members of this House to remember their vote on the demand itself, to remember that they have supported the demand which was put before the House on behalf of the people of India by a very large majority, and also to ask themselves if they think that the response given by the Secretary of State and by the Government of India is anything like a satisfactory response to a demand of that kind. I have not the remotest doubt in my mind that all elected Members, I mean Indian elected Members, will have no doubt whatever upon this point. And if that is so, I claim their support; I ask them and appeal to them not only to support me in this House by any observations that they may have to make but by their votes.

On a point of personal explanation, the remedy is suggested in the Resolution itself, and denial of that remedy has resulted in the moving of this motion.

I am not permitted to give out secrets.

On a point of personal explanation, Sir, may I say that there is not a word that has been uttered by Mr. Patel which does not represent the opinion of the Swaraj party and, as a Swarajist, I do not dissociate myself from anything that he has said. There is only a difference of language. I chose to use my own words and he chooses his own.

Because we were not expressing the same idea.

We want real constitutional progress.

Sir, I quite agree with my friend Mr. Lohokare that the very reasons which have been given by my Honourable friend Mr. Calvert are the strongest possi-

make a statement As the House will remember, in speaking yesterday on my motion for the total remission of the first demand, I made it perfectly clear that we were pressing that motion in order to establish a principle. I was speaking as a member of the whole Nationalist Party and not of that section only of the party which consists of Swarajists. I went further and said that the step we were taking was no part of what is called the wrecking policy generally attributed to that section. Now, Sir, we went to divisions on the first four of the demands yesterday, and every one of those demands was rejected by a majority. Since then we have met and considered the position and we have come to the conclusion that we have established the principle which we maintain and that it would not be necessary in dealing with the subsequent demands for grants to-day and on the following days to continue the same procedure. We therefore are now agreeable to let the discussion on the remaining demands proceed in the ordinary course. I make this statement to make the position of the Nationalist Party quite clear and I hope it will be received, especially by the Treasury Benches, in the spirit in which it is made.

*281. The Indian Finance Bill, 17 March 1924<sup>1</sup>*

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, I had no intention to take part in this debate as I did not feel well and strong enough to do so. But the speech with which the Honourable the Home Member has just treated the House has inspired in me the strength which would otherwise be wanting. The Honourable the Home Member has on more occasions than one, during my brief experience of this House, by his special polemics shown himself to be a past master in the art which is usually practised by the whole of the Government of India. That art is the art of "divide and rule." We have seen on many occasions that the great argument which he has against any proposition which is advanced by this section of the House is to point out to those who he fears will follow us into the lobby and vote in favour of that proposition, the grave danger in which they stand if they do so. He is never remiss in pointing out to the non-Swarajists the dangers of their associating themselves with the Swarajists, to those who are not in the Nationalist Party the very grave and serious dangers of their joining or voting with the Nationalist Party; and to-day, Sir, we have witnessed an exhibition of that art almost to perfection. My Honourable friend has told those who are not for a wrecking policy to beware how they cast in their lot with those who openly and professedly, before they came into this Assembly, were wreckers, whose object was to make the Government impossible. He has reminded those who were very anxious and keen about seeing the Report of the Tariff Committee, that if they in any way lent their support to this party—he did not call it a party of revolution, but he said enough to identify this party with a party of revolution—if they identified themselves with this party they would have no chance to see the report of the Tariff Committee put into

<sup>1</sup>*The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. IV, Part III, 13th March, 1924 to 25th March, 1924, Delhi, 1924, pp. 1949-56.*

operation, there would be no taxation, the Government would come to a standstill, there would be no meeting of this Assembly and no discussion of the Tariff Committee's report. I need not go further into the various means which were adopted by my Honourable friend. I am here now to make as simple and as plain a statement as my Honourable friend has made on behalf of Government.

Sir, the position today is exactly the same as it was on the day when this session opened. My Honourable friend has refrained from criticising the Swarajist manifesto—I consider it to be one of the greatest honours that was reserved for me in my life to be the author of that manifesto—he has reserved his remarks thinking that thereby he was sparing me. To-day he referred to it only to say that enough had been said about it in the House of Lords. I repeat that that manifesto is a document of which I shall ever be proud. It is a document which clearly and unequivocally states the case of the Swarajists on which they sought election to this Assembly and the Provincial Councils. They adhere to that as their case to-day as Swarajists. I took pains to point out on previous occasions as to how it was that I, a sworn Swarajist, a confirmed Swarajist, was using the instruments and the means that lay at my disposal in this Assembly to push forward the national demand and to see what response that demand elicited from the authorities before whom it was presented. I said in terms which cannot admit of any doubt that we had come into this Assembly, non-co-operators as we were, to offer you our co-operation, but on our own terms. Those terms were not dictated by a spirit of hostility to the Government but were considered in consultation with other friends who were not Swarajists. Those terms were put before the whole country and opinions were invited. All schools of thought, all shades of opinion concurred that we could not in the interests of our country put the national demand lower than what we had put it. Having satisfied ourselves as to the nature of the demand and the acceptance it had found in the whole country, we put it forward not on behalf of the Swarajists alone, not on behalf of any particular section but, as I submitted when I was moving my amendment to the motion of my Honourable friend Mr. Rangachariar, we put it forward on behalf of the country. I scrupulously and studiously kept back all ideas and all policies which are attributed to Swarajists as well as those which, though not attributed to them, are really theirs. I said that I was for the moment sinking my identity as a Swarajist, not because I had ceased to be a Swarajist but because I had adopted certain principles which were common to me and other sections of Nationalists. We adopted those principles in order to see whether there had been that change of heart in the Government for which we had been looking during the last four years. A minimum demand, a very reasonable demand, was accordingly put forward. It was carried by an overwhelming majority of this House, supported not merely by Swarajists, not merely by members of the Nationalist Party but also by independent members who did not belong to any party. That clearly shows that, so far as this country is concerned, it was taken to be a real and national demand and not simply an extravagant demand made only with the object of provoking a negative reply and then assuming an attitude of hostility to the Government. Now what followed. After that

really and an actual fact. In those countries supplies are actually refused and the Government really comes to a standstill if they are refused. I admit it that we are not capable of achieving any such results in this country. But at any rate the least that we can do is to say that we shall be no parties to granting supplies. We adopt that procedure, for what it is worth, to have as much effect as it can possibly have having regard to our disabilities.

Then, Sir, I made a statement before this House after we came to the conclusion I have referred to. I made the statement that we had established the principle according to our own judgment—of course opinions must differ—I do not expect that the Honourable the Home Member will agree with us on that point; and I said that we shall leave—I have not got the exact words before me, but I remember having said that we shall leave the discussion on the remaining grants to take ordinary course, and such of our friends as were interested in discussing those grants on the merits, such as had studied them, would take part in the discussion. I confessed at the time and I confess now that I did not study any part of the Budget from that point of view; the other Members did discuss it and thereby showed that we are not here, as Lord Olivier put it, like children who refuse to play. We know how to play, and we showed we could if we chose to criticise the Budget and, on the question of principle the rejection of the first four grants was taken to be enough. It has been suggested by the Honourable the Home Member that this is a sudden change of attitude. Is it a sudden change, as he calls it? After having sent in amendments for the reduction of the various taxes, this apparently sudden change, says the Honourable the Home Member, is due to certain adverse criticism which has appeared in the press. Now, Sir, there has been both adverse and favourable criticism. Perhaps the Honourable the Home Member has an eye only to adverse criticism, but criticism of any kind has nothing whatever to do with the real merits of this proposition. Suppose, however, that it is adverse criticism which has led us to raise the present question and which led my Honourable friend, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, to move the rejection of the Finance Bill—does that fact in any way detract from the soundness of his arguments, if they are sound on the merits? But Sir, I deny that any amount of adverse criticism could in the least affect us or our attitude in this matter. We are here representing our constituencies, representing the people of India; we are here to do our duties regardless of anything that might be said in this House or outside this House. We are here to do our duty according to our own lights and we cannot do any better.

Now, Sir, after the discussion of the Demands, we have here the Finance Bill confronting us. What is our position in regard to that? I should like to know what the Honourable the Home Member expected it would be? I am sure he did not expect us to say "Aye" to the motion. He might have heard "Ayes" as he did in the case of my Honourable friend, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, who informs us he never voted on any of the Demands. It is obvious that the Finance Bill, as it stands, could not possibly have our approval. Well, if it did not have our entire approval, was it merely the amendments of the various clauses proposing reductions of the various taxes that would have satisfied us? Was that all we wanted? Now, Sir, what reason had my Honourable friend to make that guess? After the statement I made that

these Demands will now be discussed in the ordinary course no division was called for during the whole of the debate on the remaining grants with the exception of two. All the Demands were discussed and finished. The whole idea was to put forward all the objections that could be raised on the merits. Now what was happening in the meanwhile? Barely 10 minutes had elapsed since I had sat down on Tuesday last after making the statement which has been referred to when a cablegram was seen on the notice board of the Assembly stating that Professor Richards, M.P., had answered in the affirmative a leading question put by a member of the House that it was not the intention in any way to interfere with the ten years' programme laid down by the Act. The words of the Under Secretary were "That is the position" or "That is exactly the position" or something of that kind. Now Sir, that was the first experience that we had of the change of heart immediately after I had made that statement. Day after day elapsed and there was no sign of a Committee, a Parliamentary Committee, or even a Departmental Committee to be appointed by the Government of India. Not that a Departmental Committee would have satisfied us but I mention it to show that even the least thing that they could do was not done. And what do we find to-day? When we come to this House we find—not that we did not expect it—the very first announcement made is that the Demands that had been refused have been restored. Two or three days previously in the last issue of the Government Gazette we were treated with another little warning in the shape of new rules. What are these new rules? It has been in a manner admitted by the Honourable Sir Henry Moncreff Smith that the Government have taken the power which the existing rules did not give them, but he said it was a power derivable from the Government of India Act and was rightly derived from it. He was further questioned as to what the Member in charge of a particular Bill might do and it was pointed out to him that after amendments to a Bill had been allowed by the House, and the Bill as amended was about to be put to the vote of the House there was nothing to prevent the Member in charge from getting up and saying "Thus far and no further. Wait, I am going to get a recommendation from the Viceroy and you will have to follow that recommendation. If you do not, then a certificate will follow." It is said that these rules had been under consideration for the last two years. I do not doubt that statement but they were sent to England only in November last, which is after the date of the manifesto which has been so much talked about. It is permissible to have a shrewd suspicion that they were meant as a counterblast, as something to meet the situation which would be created if that manifesto were to be acted upon. But what is our position after the passing of those rules? We are mere automatons here; a button is pressed in the Government House and the marionettes of this House begin to dance. That is the true description of this House. We may pass amendments, we may be ready to pass a Bill as amended, but at any time it may be taken away from our hands and the Government may do as they please and call upon us to pass it as recommended by the Viceroy.

Now, Sir, these things have happened, besides the criticism in the newspapers to which the Honourable the Home Member has referred and these things have had their due weight with us. We gave enough time at least for

some indication of the mind of the Government and of the manner in which it was proposed to deal with our proposition but we have been told up to this only one thing and that is that the Government pin their faith to the Government of India Act as it stands and are not prepared to consider the revision of that Act by the appointment of a Royal Commission or a Round Table Conference. I wish to say one word about this Round Table Conference. The whole thing has been misunderstood. I tried my best to explain the position in my speech in support of the amendment to Mr. Rangachariar's proposition. I said that this Round Table Conference was to be a representative conference of every conceivable interest in this country; that we wanted all of us to put our heads together and devise a constitution which was best suited to the genius of the people and the requirements of the country. That did not mean that we were going to slavishly follow any parliamentary system adopted in a particular part of the world. It was for the representatives of the people to come together and the very first thing they would have to do would be to decide whether any of the existing systems which have been tried in America, in England or elsewhere, or an imitation thereof would be suitable to this country or not. Our position in regard to the Government of India Act, Sir, is that it is a false beginning. You assume too much when you say to us, you people of India will have to train yourselves in parliamentary institutions before you aspire to have parliamentary rights. Your conception of parliamentary duties, parliamentary rights and parliamentary procedure may be quite different to what the genius of the people might dictate to its representatives. It is not a matter which could be disposed of in a day or two, in a week or two weeks or even in a month or two months. It requires very careful deliberation by all the members of the Round Table Conference, perhaps the taking of evidence, and a number of other things. It was not, as easily supposed, something in the nature of asking for an immediate grant of responsible government, but it certainly was a demand for an immediate admission of the claim to responsible government. That was not the same thing as actually giving or establishing responsible government. Now, Sir, it is stated in the report of the speech of Lord Olivier which I have before me:

"We claim to know by centuries of experience in Europe and America the laws and conditions indispensable for the stable working of that system, which is not native to India."

That claim admits the whole of my case. I do not want a system which is not native to India. What I want the Round Table Conference to determine is a system which is native to India and of which you have no experience in Europe or America. Your experience of centuries of Europe and America will not avail you in the least to find out what system is native to India. Lord Olivier goes on to say:

"And it is perfectly plain to us that those conditions are not established in India and cannot be established in a few months by this kind of deliberation at a Round Table Conference, or the premature appointment of a Commission under the Government of India Act."

That is a misconception of the whole case. We do not want this Round Table Conference or a Royal Commission to, as it were by magic, create conditions which do not exist in this country. We want to investigate the conditions



which do exist in this country, and with full regard to these conditions and the capacity of the people, we want this Round Table Conference to arrive at a system of government, which may turn out to have many things in common with the parliamentary systems you know but not necessarily so. That, Sir, was not a thing as to which anybody could say off hand, "Oh, we are not going to consider it at all." But that is in effect what was said, and therefore we said we were thoroughly dissatisfied. Now we are told that, whatever we may say, whatever we may do, the British nation will not give any further advance unless it is satisfied that such advance will be for the benefit of the country. That is said to be the plain fact and it means that the British parliament must in all events be the sole arbiter of the measure, the manner and the time of each advance. Now, that is a proposition, Sir, which we cannot accept, and as long as you insist upon that, so long we shall insist upon the contrary. Meanwhile whatever means are available to us we shall employ them if they are legitimate and peaceful means. We have come here to employ the means which are available to us under the Statute and under the rules, and so long as we employ those means you cannot refer to such action as may possibly be taken or is being actually taken outside this House. We are here Swarajists and non-Swarajists, members of the Nationalist Party, to stand upon our rights as representatives of the people—rights which we derive from the Statute itself—and which we can only exercise within the four corners of the Statute and within the rules. And, therefore, so long as we are here, we must, if we want to do our duty, conform to the Act and to the rules. That is very different to what we may do outside but you cannot say, "Oh, you have changed yourselves". We have not changed ourselves at all. It all depends upon the surroundings and upon the circumstances. I said plainly and unequivocally in my first speech in this House addressing myself specially to the Treasury Benches—"We are here to offer you our co-operation, accept it if you like, and if you do, we are your men. If you do not, well we shall go out—you call it the wilderness, be it so; we shall go out into the wilderness but we do not in the least intend to deviate from the line of policy which we have laid down for ourselves outside this House." I submit it is not fair for the Honourable the Home Member to rely upon the policies and the lines of action which are open to us and which we do not mean to abandon—to rely upon them and ask those who have made up their minds as to the reasonableness of the demand which was put forward by the nation and the unsatisfactory nature of the response which has been given by the Government not to join the Nationalist Party. Given that the demand is a reasonable one, given that the answer is a most unsatisfactory one there is open to us no other policy, no other principle, no other doctrine than the one we have adopted and no hair-splitting arguments can avoid the inevitable result that we must refuse supplies. That is what we have agreed upon and everybody knows it. The Honourable the Home Member said he is not aware of the constitution of this party. He has read all the adverse criticism of their action but not the rules of this party which have been published from time to time; even the names of the members have been published—there is no secret about it.

Now, Sir, I do not want to take up much more time of the House but would like to make one or two observations before I sit down. I have been at

great pains to discover the meaning of certain very simple English words and have often wondered whether they retained the same meaning as I was taught at school and college, which they still retain in the dictionary, or whether they should be more properly used in a sense which is not explained in the books. What is said is "If you act in a particular way you are irresponsible; the Government would take it as a demonstration of irresponsibility". Now, Sir, I thought that responsibility arose out of a man's own action, his own word, his own deed. How is one man responsible for another's words or deeds, I fail to see. It is you who frame your Budget; it is you who raise the income, it is you who regulate the expenditure, and you say "If you do not say 'ditto' to what we say or do you are an irresponsible person". And then it was said—my Honourable friend the Finance Member said—that we shall by not acting as we are told be proving our unfitness for our duties. Now, Sir, however able my Honourable friend the Finance Member may be in his finance, I do not think he has any right to tell me or any other Member of the House that we are not fit to discharge our duties as Members of this House. I do not pretend to be an expert in his line, but there are things in which I think my Honourable friend will not pretend to be any better than I. But what is fitness? Fitness here means, if you see eye to eye with the Government, you are fit for responsible government. If you do certain things which will please the Government, you are fit. I should have considered our fitness in relation to the people whom we represent, and not in relation to the Government. Whether we are fit to represent them it is for them and not for the Government to say.

Then, Sir, there is much talk of political responsibility. But I ask can there be any political responsibility without political rights in the particular department in which responsibility is cast upon a particular person?

I will not now detain the House any longer, but would like again to make it perfectly clear that what we are now doing is being done not because we have changed our minds by reason of the adverse criticism or the taunts that have been levelled at us in this House and outside it, but because we have now given up all hope of our demand being conceded. There is no sign that there will be an early compliance even with what little was foreshadowed in the speeches in this House and in the House of Lords. What we are doing, I say again, merely amounts to the strongest protest we can make. We are using the strongest weapon available to us. We can do no more. I expect that in the step proposed to be taken the House is with me—I beg the House to vote with one voice in support of my Honourable friend Pandit Malaviya, and to reject the motion to take the Bill into consideration. It will then not be necessary for us to go into the amendments proposed which were put in as a matter of ordinary precaution. My Honourable and learned friend the Home Member has misunderstood the object of the amendment. We put forward a proposition as the first to be considered. That proposition is the best, the most suited, the most liked. If that fails, as a precautionary measure, we put in a certain number of subsidiary propositions. That does not mean that the latter by reason merely of being put in first, contradict the former or weaken our position when we support the main proposition. Sir, I hope I have made my position clear and I do not wish to detain the House any longer. I beg all the Members or

at least all the elected Members of this House to vote in a body in support of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya's contention against the motion.

*282. The Indian Finance Bill, 18 March 1924<sup>1</sup>*

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, I take the earliest possible opportunity of opposing this motion to introduce the Bill in the way in which it has been introduced. Before I go further I should like at once to disclaim any intention on my own part or on the part of any Member of this House to offer any personal insult or affront to His Excellency the Viceroy. I say so, Sir, because it has been brought to my notice that on a former occasion, when the introduction of a Bill under somewhat similar circumstances was opposed in this House, it was interpreted to mean something in the nature of a discourtesy to His Excellency. Nothing is farther from our minds than a desire to show His Excellency or any Member of the Government any personal discourtesy by opposing this motion. On the contrary, Sir, the view that we take of the matter is that the procedure adopted on behalf of the Government is an affront to this House involving contempt for the vote of this House which was recorded yesterday. As I then pointed out, the new rules which have been taken advantage of in re-introducing the Bill in its present form were only published last week. They were partly discussed yesterday on the floor of this House. The pistol, which was loaded yesterday, is levelled at our heads to-day. Under those very rules this Bill is now brought forward with the recommendation of His Excellency. It is now being introduced, and the next motion will be to consider it and to pass it in terms of the recommendation. If I stand up to oppose it, I do so because the rules permit me to take that course, and I submit that I am within my rights in opposing the introduction of this Bill at the earliest possible opportunity. Sir, apart from the fact that the rules under which this Bill is sought to be re-introduced are unconstitutional in their nature, a question which I will not go into on this occasion, we have the further fact that this House, or at least the elected Members of this House, have been taken by surprise. It is true that by the courtesy of the Honourable the Home Member I was informed on the telephone last night at about 11 o'clock that the Bill was to be re-introduced this morning with the recommendation of His Excellency. But it is obvious, Sir, that at that late hour in the night I could not possibly inform the Members who had dispersed that same evening and some of whom had gone to their respective homes. I was not on the same advantageous ground as the Honourable the Home Member was in regard to the supporters of the Government. We find to-day that the place of our esteemed Colleague, Mr. K.C. Roy, is occupied by an equally estimable gentleman, but it is not for us to fill up any vacant places in the manner in which the Government can. We know that Mr. K.C. Roy has gone on a deputation as a member of a Committee. I am not aware if he has ceased to be a Member of this House.

...

As you are aware a question on the subject was submitted to you, Sir, by my friend, Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha, from Bihar. That question was intended to elicit the information which has now been partly furnished by my friend, the Home Member, and my friend, Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith. I am sorry, Sir, that at question time perhaps it escaped your notice and my friend, Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha, was not called upon to put the question ...

...

Sir, I leave that matter there. The fact remains that here is a gentleman occupying the place of another gentleman who is now on the high seas. We are informed that he resigned before the gentleman, we have the pleasure to find among ourselves to-day, was appointed. All that information is certainly enough to satisfy the requirements of the rules, but, as was suggested by some friend in the House, we do not know whether the resignation of Mr. K.C. Roy was submitted in writing before he left, or whether it was received by wire from Bombay, or by wireless from mid-ocean. However that may be, we have the disadvantage now of having to deal with this measure at a time when we could not be expected to be fully prepared for it. The usual course, as the House is aware, was for this Bill, after it was thrown out by this House, to be laid before the other House. (Mr. President here shook his head in dissent.) That was under the old rules, Sir; that is how I understand them. It would come back to this House only after passing through the other. However that may be, Sir, I do not pretend to be an expert in the procedure of the two Houses, and am only speaking from information. At any rate the fact remains that there has been some unnecessary haste uncalled for in the circumstances, even in the case of a Finance Bill; but I do not put my opposition solely on that ground. My main grounds for opposing the Bill are the same as were put before this House first at great length by my friend, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, and then by myself. Of course those grounds do not appeal to my friend, the Honourable the Home Member, and he says "Hear, hear", but I did not hear one word from him yesterday to refute the arguments my friend, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, had advanced.

...

Whatever is unanswerable, it is a waste of time to answer. Now, Sir, I have only to make an appeal to this House, and particularly to those Honourable Members who either did not take part in the voting yesterday, or who voted in favour of the motion of the Honourable the Finance Member. I appeal to them to consider the circumstances under which the present Bill is being re-introduced. I know there have been some modifications in it. The Honourable the Finance Member has by reason of those modifications been pleased to describe it as an emasculated Bill. Of course any alterations in a Bill which are in favour of the subject and which the subject considers as an improvement on the Bill are, in the eyes of the Finance Department, an emasculation of the Bill.

...

But they are all in favour of the subject.

...

My friend will permit me to say that, in spite of my general ignorance of finance, I know this much—that certain duties which were proposed to be levied had really the effect of protecting the interests of the people. However, I need not go further into the matter. What I was submitting—and I was addressing myself specially to the Members of the House who did not vote yesterday or who voted in favour of the motion of the Honourable the Finance Member—was that the circumstances to-day are entirely different. The re-introduction of this Bill does not merely mean the carrying through of a finance measure. The circumstances under which it is put forward and sought to be carried through are circumstances which amount, as I have already said, to an affront to the House. I do hope and trust that all Honourable Members will be jealous of the dignity and the honour of the House. I appeal to their own sense of honour, I appeal to one and all of them, at least on this ground if on no other, to vote against this measure.

### 283. *Abolition of the Cotton Excise, 20 March 1924*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, my Honourable friend Mr. Willson<sup>2</sup> has put it to me to say whether it is fair that after sending in a number of amendments to the various Demands, a Resolution should be moved to omit the Demands altogether, and in another way the same thing has been said by my friend; Sir Charles Innes. As to what is fair and what is not fair, when everything is done according to the rules it is very difficult for any one to say. . .

That, Sir, may be my friend Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal's belief . . .

That is not what I said, Sir. I am fair in love and fair in war always. Now, Mr. Willson will remember that there was not a single amendment standing in my name to any of the Demands. I think I had made it quite clear that we, as prudent men, had taken every precaution against what might happen or what might not happen. It is the safest thing to provide for all possible contingencies. That is what we did. We put in amendments to the Demands; we also put in motions which swept the whole Demand off the board. We were prepared to take one after the other as occasion arose. Now, the rules of this House which permit amendments to be sent in, also permit motions for adjournment. The motion made by my friend, Mr. Neogy<sup>3</sup>, was made in strict accordance with the rules. If it does not suit the

<sup>1</sup>The *Legislative Assembly Debates*, Vol. IV, Part III, 13th March, 1924 to 25th March, 1924, Delhi, 1924, pp. 2034-36.

<sup>2</sup>W.S.J. Willson; b. 1876; member, Bihar and Orissa Legislative Council, 1920; Vice-President, Indian Mining Association, 1920-21; member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1922-28; member of various Standing Committees including Commerce and Industry, Railways etc.; d. 1952.

<sup>3</sup>Kshutish Chandra Neogy, b. 1888; advocate, Calcutta High Court; member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1921-34, 1942-47, Adviser to Indian States Delegation to the Round Table Conferences, 1930-32; Dewan of Mayurbhanj State, 1935-40, Political Adviser, 1940-42; member, Human Rights Commission, U.N.O., 1946; Chairman, Planning Advisory Board, Government of India, 1946, Minister of Rehabilitation, 1947; Minister of Commerce, 1948; resigned in 1950 as a protest against Nehru-Liaquat Pact; Chairman, First Finance Commission, 1951-53; d. 1977.

Official Benches or if it does not suit any particular Member, because it postpones his opportunities to please his electors, that is a matter, Sir, in which those who support the adjournment are not interested. If it is for you, Sir, to pronounce your opinion upon the question I should like you to do so. The question is whether it is not the duty of the Government Benches to be ready with every item of business which concerns them on the day's agenda. It is not so very long ago that I discontinued my practice at the bar. I have concerned with heavy cases, with briefs extending over hundreds and sometimes thousands of pages. I have burnt the midnight oil in studying one particular brief, and the next morning I have been told that that case was not going to be taken up. When I stood up to make a very humble protest to the learned judges—I was told it was my business to be ready in every case in which I appeared. I say the same thing to the Treasury Benches. If there are 5 items which they have got to prepare, it is their business to distribute the work among themselves, so that one or more of them might be ready to deal with every item. It is no concern of ours that they would like to answer to-day a certain observation made in a speech moving the Resolution. I do not see, Sir, how that can carry any weight with the House.

...

What I mean is simply this, Sir, that my friend Sir Charles Innes referred to his great preparation for this occasion. That preparation is there and will serve him on some other occasion. I thought he suggested that his great preparation would go for nothing. That is my impression.

...

So far as that goes, Government ought to be well accustomed by this time to hear very grave charges as we on our side are well accustomed to have no answer even when there was an opportunity for the Government to reply. However, the Government is not shut out from giving their reply. These matters, I submit, are for the House to consider. I take it, that a motion for adjournment as such is a motion for the House to decide as is the case with any other motion. If the House attaches more importance to the other Resolutions which are laid down on the agenda, the House will, of course, give its opinion accordingly. As to the fact that political questions loom very large in this House, I say, Sir, that it is in the nature of things that they should do so. Here we are struggling for our very existence while our friends are interested in trade and commerce. That is very natural for them. But we who have to get, so to speak, a place in the Sun to obtain the right even to walk erect in our own streets, cannot consider their commercial interests more important than our political rights. It all depends on what the majority of the House attach greater importance to. If it is to political rights, they will devote the greater part of the time of the House to those rights. If it is to something else, they will decide accordingly. I therefore support this motion of my Honourable friend, Mr. Neogy, and I hope that the House will vote in favour of it.

before this taxation was contemplated? Is it not always the case, in every case of fresh taxation, that people are taken by surprise? In the case of ordinary taxation Bills they do not even have the opportunities or the foreknowledge which they had in this case? I will ask the House to leave entirely out of consideration the fact that this is a protection Bill when you are considering the question of exemptions from the tax. Look upon it merely and solely as a taxation Bill. Now I ask you, suppose for one moment that this taxation had been proposed at the time of the Budget in the Finance Bill, would it have been any answer to say "the Bombay Corporation have given such a large contract; the Calcutta Corporation also have given a very big contract and they will be great sufferers if this taxation is imposed?" Of course any taxation Bill may be thrown out on its own merits, but, admitting that the tax is a good tax, can it be said that there should be special exemptions made in favour of persons who had placed orders before the new tax was contemplated? I say on principle that that is no answer to a fresh taxation Bill.

Then we come to the special equities of the case. What are the special equities of the case? There has been an *ad misericordiam* appeal made both by Mr. Patel and Mr. Jamnadas Mehta that they have suffered. Why? Because Tatas are the wrong-doers and they have placed them in this predicament. I hold no brief for the Tatas, but in order to examine whether there are any special equities in the case, let us see what the case really comes to. It comes to this, that at the request of the Tata Construction Company - I will admit for the moment, as Mr. Patel has said, that the Construction Company and the Steel Company are one and the same;—well, at the request of the Tatas the time for making tenders was extended. Now what does that mean? It means that the Tatas go to the Corporation and say that they are not in a position to come to an understanding with the Corporation, nor to enter into a contract with them, because they want more time to give their terms. The time is given. At the end of that time, Tatas say: "Thank you for giving us the time, but we are not in a position to enter into any contract with you." Where is the equity, where is the wrong done, and what court of law will ever consider that a cause of action for damages has arisen? I submit, Sir, that on both these grounds there is no case made out not only for the Bombay Corporation, but for any exemption whatever on the ground that any prior contracts had been made before the Tariff Board made their recommendations.

### 285. *The Steel Industry (Protection) Bill, 4 June 1924*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, as a member of the Select Committee I wish to make one or two observations on this point. As my Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes has pointed out, this is in effect only a gesture and that was the argument which was put by him before the Select Committee on the strength of the findings of the Tariff Board. Now, Sir, we are taking the findings of the Tariff Board because we have no materials before us to show that that findings

<sup>1</sup> *The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. IV, Part IV, 27th May to 11th June 1924, Simla, 1924, pp. 2571-72, 2618-20.*

are wrong. The British and the foreign companies who might like to introduce their capital in the steel industry are in no way bound by the findings of the Tariff Board. I do not think that the opinion of the Tariff Board that it will take five years before you can produce a pound of steel in this country is by any means final. We know at what rapid rate science is progressing. We know that there are foreign companies with enormous resources at their back. I do not think that it will be safe for this House to take the assurance of the Tariff Board that you are quite safe for the next five years because no concern coming in from a foreign country will be able to produce anything within that period and, as the life of this Bill is only three years there is nothing to fear. Vested interests will arise even if no steel is produced and we shall have to consider a number of auxiliary questions before we can at some later stage introduce legislation which my Honourable friend Mr. Patel wishes to introduce to-day. Before these complications arise it is therefore necessary for this House to safeguard the interests of the Indian industry and to keep it in the hands of Indians as far as possible. Now, Sir, we were told that this Bill is not a Bill in the interests of the Tata Company or any other Company. It is in the interests of the Indian industry, and I take it that the only reason why we are extending any protection to the Tatas is that in the near future we expect other companies will arise and begin operations so that there will be internal competition and thereby the ratepayer in the long run will be the gainer. Well, if it is not for the Tata Company, is it for any other company? I think, Sir, if there is any place in which it ought to be made clear as to what companies this Bill will apply it is in this provision of the Bill. There are no complications as indeed there would be, if we were to introduce labour legislation into this Bill. In the latter case there is a variety of considerations to be gone into and we would be unduly encumbering this Bill with a number of special provisions, and after doing so we may, in the end, find that we have not done justice to the cause of labour that stands upon a different footing altogether. I am quite at one with the Honourable Government Members upon that point. Not that I am not as anxious as my friend Mr. Joshi or my friend Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha to secure the interests of labour but because I think that the method proposed by them is not suitable. In this matter, however, there is nothing but a short definition of the companies to which the Bill applies that is required. I do not think there can be any fear that by rushing this short amendment we shall be complicating things so as to make us repent hereafter. The alteration asked for involves a principle, which is not new, which has been fully considered and which has been affirmed by the Fiscal Committee, and indirectly by this House. It is a proposition which has been long before the country and I think there can be no question that a great volume of public opinion is in support of it. That being the case, I do not see how it can be said that the amendment is beyond the scope of the Bill. In fact, it limits the scope of the Bill, and anything that limits the scope of the Bill must necessarily be within its scope. I therefore submit that the amendment proposed by my friend the Honourable Mr. Patel is quite in order.

Sir I have, no intention at this late hour to inflict a speech on this House.



I have been watching this debate with the keenest interest and I can assure the House that all the time there has been a struggle going on in my mind between two principles—the principle that indigenous industry should be protected against foreign invasion, and the principle that foreign capital is as much necessary for the development of the country as Indian capital. During the continuance of that conflict, I have tried to solve my difficulties by the help of the speeches that have been made. That is the reason why I am the last person to stand before this House in this debate. My difficulty is that, while there is a genuine desire, and a very natural desire, on the part of this House to protect Indian industries from foreign invasion, there is the alternative that, if they insist upon it, the effect will be that the Government will not accept the amendment and the Bill will practically be thrown out. I have been considering all this time as to what my plain duty is under the circumstances. It is true that we are entirely in the hands of the Government so far as this Bill is concerned, if we do not want to throw it out. Mr. Dumasia<sup>1</sup> indulged in an appropriate figure of speech when he said that the noose was round the necks of the consumers and the string in the hands of the Tatas.

...  
I think at the present moment that metaphor applies more to this House and the Government than to the Tatas and the consumers. The noose is round the neck of the House and the end of the string is in the hands of my friend the Honourable Sir Charles Innes. Now, it is said that it will be difficult to include in this Bill the complex provisions that would be necessary to attain the desired result, and indeed we are ourselves not quite clear as to what it is that should be included in the Bill. I admit that there is great force in this contention. But there is nothing, in my humble judgment, to prevent this House from committing itself to the principle without going into any details whatever. Assurances have been given from Government benches that a new Committee or the old Advisory Committee or the Finance Committee will at once be called upon to consider this matter and then the Government will see what steps to take. That, I submit, is not a committal to any policy whatever. The very least that I expect the Government to do is to commit themselves to the principle underlying all these amendments without committing themselves to any particular amendment or the details of it. Now when I am asking that, I am not asking anything new, because we have it in the Fiscal Commission's Report at page 161 where a Member of this Government, the Honourable Mr. Chatterjee, on behalf of Government stated:

"The settled policy of the Government of India, as I think we have mentioned more than once in this Assembly, is that no concession should be given to any firms in regard to industries in India, unless such firms have a rupee capital, unless such firms have a proportion, at any rate, of Indian directors, and unless such firms allow facilities for Indian apprentices to be trained in their works. This has been mentioned more than once, and I can only repeat this declaration."

<sup>1</sup>N.M. Dumasia; b. 1871; journalist, member, Bombay Legislative Council, 1921-23, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1923-26 and 1930-34; served on the editorial staff of the *Times of India*; member, Bombay Municipal Corporation for 10 years, Bombay Improvement Trust, d. 1943.

This being the settled policy of the Government of India, if nothing has happened to induce the Government to change that policy, where is the difficulty and where is the harm in putting in a very innocent provision in this Bill declaring that that is the policy? Now as to how that may be done, we might consider the alternative proposal of my friend Mr. Patel—I know it is not before the House—but I am just referring to it as my own suggestion. I put it in my own way, and I would beg the attention of my Honourable friends opposite to the alternative amendment that I propose. It would run something like this.

“Provided that nothing in sections 3 and 4 shall apply to any company, firm or other person who starts the business of manufacturing steel rails, fish-plates or iron or steel wagons after the passing of this Act except under such conditions as to the proportion of Indian capital and the Indian element in the management as may be determined by the Governor General in Council in concurrence with the Indian Legislative Assembly.”

You have here the recognition of the principle leaving everything else in the hands of the Governor General in Council to be given effect to by rules to be made by him with the concurrence of the Assembly. It is a suggestion which I make with the concurrence of my Honourable friend Mr. Patel who will be willing to adopt it as his own amendment. And when I put it forward as an amendment, I do not ask the Government to go in the least out of their way, but to concede a principle to which, in my humble judgment, they have been committed all these years. While the control of this House is preserved, the amendment is flexible enough to give the Government their proper share in the determination and selection of the companies which will be entitled to the benefit of these provisions, and what is more important it recognises the principle on which the House insists. Beyond that, it does not go. If necessary, I will move this as a formal amendment, but I hope that my Honourable friends opposite will see their way to accept it.

Now, there is one thing which I wish very clearly to bring to the notice of my Honourable friends opposite. The one predominant note of the whole debate has been suspicion, suspicion, suspicion; distrust, distrust, distrust. On the one side, there is the suspicion of the Tatas, on the other side, there is the distrust of the Government. Now I cannot say that such suspicion and distrust is wholly unjustifiable. On the contrary, there is good ground for it, as has been pointed out by speaker after speaker, in the past history of this country. So far as Tatas are concerned, that suspicion ranges round the question of labour, its treatment and management. But, that is not the point now before the House. As regards the Government I do not at all mean to convey that I agree with those Members who suspect that the real object of this Bill is to introduce foreign companies into this country. That is an extravagant assumption to make and I cannot be any party to it. But that the Bill leaves a very wide door open for such companies to come in, there is not the slightest doubt. Not that I will not welcome them when they come, if they will let us also have a finger in the pie, but not otherwise. All I ask the House to do is to acknowledge this principle for the present and leave the rest to the rules to be made by the Governor General in Council in concurrence with this

House. That is my suggestion, Sir, and I hope and trust that it will be adopted by my friends. I am willing to make any verbal alterations in my draft to suit them; but if they do not see their way to accept it, then I really will be placed in a very difficult position because I cannot honestly ask the House to forego this principle altogether and rest content with the promise that the matter will be considered in a particular committee. I could accept even that if it involved a recognition of the principle—I do not mean that I do not take that assurance such as it is—but what does it come to? It simply comes to this that you say to us: "You people have taken so much time over this question: all right we will discuss it with you on some future occasion." A non-committal sort of thing. I want this House, including the Government Members, to recognise and declare a principle only and leave the rest of the matter to be settled in the best way in which it can be done. That is my suggestion, Sir, and I formally move this amendment:

"That at the end of clause 3, the following proviso be added, namely:

'Provided that nothing in this section and section 4 shall apply to any company, firm or other person who starts the business of manufacturing steel rails, fish-plates or wagons after the passing of this Act except under such conditions as to the proportion of Indian capital and Indian element in the management as may be determined by the Governor General in Council in concurrence with the Indian Legislative Assembly'."

#### 286. *The Steel Industry (Protection) Bill, 5 June 1924*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, you were pleased to give the House time to consider the question of the amendment proposed by my friend, the Honourable Mr. Patel, and the amendment to that amendment which I suggested yesterday. Now, after careful consideration, Sir, I would beg your permission to alter the amendment to Mr. Patel's amendment, which I had the honour to propose yesterday. I now beg your leave to move the following to take the place of Patel's amendment. It runs as follows:

"That clause 5 be re-numbered as clause 6 and, after clause 4, the following clause be inserted:

' 5. Notwithstanding anything contained in section 3 or section 4, no Conditions qualifying bounty in respect of steel rails, fish-plates or for bounties. wagons shall be payable to or on behalf of any company, firm or other person not already engaged at the commencement of this Act in the business of manufacturing any one or other of such articles, unless such company, firm or person provides facilities to the satisfaction of the Governor General in Council for the technical training of Indians in the manufacturing processes involved in the business and, in the case of a company, unless—

- (a) it has been formed and registered under the Indian Companies Act, 1913; and
- (b) it has a share capital the amount of which is expressed in the memo-

drafting the amendment so as to cover both these clauses. It is for this purpose that a separate clause has been proposed. It is really an amendment to the proposition before the House as put by Mr. Patel, but inasmuch as the same proposition will be before the House in connection with clause 4 and in order to avoid repetition, as a mere matter of drafting I have put it as a separate clause, the subject matter being the same.

I formally move the amendment which has already been read out to the House.

287. *Recommendations of the Lee Commission, 10 September 1924*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, I rise to move the Nationalist amendment\* to

<sup>1</sup>*The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. IV, Part V, 3rd September to 16th September, 1924, Simla, 1924, pp. 3147-62.*

\*"That for the original Resolution the following be substituted:

**'PART I**

That having regard to the following among other facts, namely:

(a) That the Royal Commission on the Superior Civil Services in India was appointed, and allowed to enter upon its functions in utter disregard of the Resolutions passed by the first Assembly;

(b) That all questions affecting the Civil Services are inseparably connected with, and entirely dependent upon, the larger question of the grant of responsible government to India and cannot be entertained and satisfactorily dealt with unless and until the Resolution of this House on Responsible Government adopted on 18th February, 1924, is substantially complied with;

(c) That the terms of reference to the said Royal Commission and the recommendations made by it involve the perpetuation of an antiquated and anachronio system of public services without any attempt to reconstruct the administrative machinery to suit the present day conditions of India which are widely different from those prevailing when it was inaugurated;

(d) That the said terms of reference to the said Royal Commission and the recommendations made by it are based on the unwarranted assumption that the existing system of government, both Central and Provincial, and the present position, powers and functions of the Secretary of State, the Governor General and the Governors of Provinces, would continue indefinitely;

(e) That some of the recommendations of the Royal Commission are intended to deprive the Legislatures even of their existing powers by suggesting devices to transfer items of expenditure hitherto subject to the vote of the Assembly and the Provincial Councils to the head of non-votable items;

(f) That the said recommendations have introduced racial discriminations in the treatment of the All-India Services;

(g) That the said recommendations make the extraordinary provision that officers appointed to the All-India Services after 1919 as also those to be appointed hereafter shall have guarantees against and compensation for being transferred from the reserved to the transferred field of Service—a contingency which they must be taken to be well aware of when they were appointed;

the Government Resolution which has just been so very ably moved by the Honourable the Home Member. The amendment stands in my name, and I wish to make it perfectly clear at the very outset that it is a Nationalist amendment. It is rather long and I would follow the example of the Honourable the Home Member in dealing with it. I shall not inflict it upon the House by reading it from beginning to end.

Sir, before I go into my amendment I think it is but due to the Honourable the Home Member that I should congratulate him on the great ability and perspicuity with which he has dealt with the subject. He has dealt with it very fairly and has not overdone any part which related to the benefit of the Services. But remembering the undertaking that he gave at question time

absorb the present Indian Medical Service into the Royal Army Medical Corps (India)—a step which will practically close the door to Indian medical men in the said corps and thereby also in civil employment;

(f) That the inquiry held by the Royal Commission has been unsatisfactory in that the bulk of the evidence on which the bald recommendations of the Commission are based was allowed to be tendered and accepted in camera and no material evidence is either indicated or made available to this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that the recommendations of the Royal Commission on the Superior Civil Services of India be not accepted, and this Assembly further recommends that instead of the recommendations referred to in clause (1), sub-clauses (a), (b) and (c) and clause (2) of Sir Alexander Muddiman's Resolution so far as the latter relates to future entrants into the Civil Services being approved, the following steps be taken in respect of future recruitment and control of the Services, namely:

(i) That all further recruitment in England for the Civil Services in India including the Medical Service under the existing rules be stopped.

(ii) That a Public Services Commission be established in India and the constitution and functions of that Commission be determined on the recommendations of a Committee elected by this Assembly.

(iii) That His Majesty's Government be requested to take the necessary steps for the purpose of transferring the powers of appointment and control of the Services, now vested in the Secretary of State, to the Government of India and the Local Governments, such powers to be exercised under laws to be passed by the Indian and Local Legislatures regulating the Public Services, including the classification of the Civil Services in India, the methods of their recruitment, their conditions of service, pay, and allowances and discipline and conduct.

## PART II

This Assembly is unable in view of the present financial condition of India and on the materials before it to satisfy itself as to the propriety and reasonableness of the recommendations of the Royal Commission in respect of the alleged grievances of those at present holding office in the Civil Services, and cannot with due regard to the interests of the tax-payer assent to the imposing of fresh burdens on the already overburdened finances of the country.

But, in view of the financial relief that will result from the stoppage of all recruitment outside India under the existing rules as recommended above in Part I, this Assembly is prepared to consider the alleged grievances of the present incumbents as regards pay, passages, concessions and pensions and recommends such measures of redress as may be found necessary, and for that purpose it recommends to the Governor General in Council to take steps for the election of a Committee by this House to enable them to go into the entire question on all the materials available to the Royal Commission including the evidence taken in camera or such other material as may be available and to make its recommendations to this House as early as possible."

about the materials that he was going to place before this House, I must confess to a feeling of great nervousness all the time that I was listening to his very elaborate speech. I was listening to it almost with bated breath and at every moment I expected that some new material, something which we could not guess at from the report, would be forthcoming. I saw something protruding from the files in front of him and took it to be the fuse of the bomb under his table. I expected every moment the bomb to be thrown and sooner or later to burst upon us. I waited and waited and it was only when the Honourable the Home Member resumed his seat that I heaved a sigh of relief. The bomb did not after all explode; it was not even thrown, and we remain, so far as the materials go, where we were before the Honourable the Home Member began his speech.

Now, Sir, he made certain preliminary remarks about the value to be attached to this Report, and I wish to deal with them point by point. What he said was that this Report was made by a Royal Commission which was constituted by gentlemen of the highest position and attainments. Nobody has ever doubted or disputed that. The next point he made was that the recommendations were the result of a compromise. It is here, Sir, that I would beg to enter my dissent. Compromise between whom? Who were the parties to that compromise? The Honourable the Home Member said that the Indian gentlemen on the Commission were representative Indians. Here again, Sir, I beg to join issue. Who elected them; whose representatives were they, and what position did they occupy in the public life of the country apart from their relations with the Government or their membership of one of the two Houses of Legislature, at one time or another? Then the Honourable the Home Member said that we must take it as a verdict of the jury, and that we must attach to it the same weight as we would attach to a unanimous verdict of a jury. Now, Sir, I have had something to do with juries, and I know under what circumstances weight is attached to the verdict of a jury, and under what circumstances no weight at all is attached to it. When the evidence is taken in open Court and the public are in possession of the facts from day to day as the trial proceeds, when the learned Judge has charged the jury in public and has reviewed the whole facts and given the law of the case, it is then that the unanimous verdict of a jury is entitled to all the weight that can be claimed for it. But without any of these things the very basis which gives the jury its weight is wanting and the verdict is of no value.

Then my Honourable friend justified the Report of the Royal Commission by the rule of *factum valet*. Here again I regret I am unable to follow my learned friend. The doctrine of *factum valet* is very well known to lawyers. It means that irregularities which had no effect on the essentials or contravene any principle must be condoned when the thing itself is done. Such irregularities must not be allowed to disturb what has already been accomplished. We have heard of an adoption or a marriage not being allowed to be questioned on the doctrine of *factum valet*, if all the objections urged against it are mere irregularities which do not go to the very root. I ask the House in the present instance whether it can possibly be said that the objections we take to the Report are mere objections of form and irregularity which do not touch

the merits. The objections we take are objections which vitiate the whole proceedings, which go to the very root of every recommendation that the Royal Commission has made, as I shall proceed to show when I deal with the various paragraphs of my amendment. That being so, there is no justification whatever for invoking the doctrine of *factum valet* in support of the Report.

Now, Sir, I shall follow the course which the Honourable the Home Member has followed, and only deal with my amendment in a general way as the Honourable the Home Member has dealt with his Resolution. I shall, with your permission, lay it bit by bit before the House, and as I do so, make a sort of running comment to explain any points which I may think are necessary to be explained.

Now the whole scheme of the amendment is quite clear. It is divided into two parts. The first part gives the grounds upon which we say that no effect should be given to the recommendations of the Royal Commission. It also gives the constructive proposals we have to make in the light of the facts stated. The second part deals with the grievances, or rather refers to the grievances of the present incumbents in the various grades of Services.

In part I we contend that the recommendations of the Lee Commission should be wholly rejected. In order to establish why this should be so, my task is facilitated by the Resolution which has been moved on behalf of the Government. I think, Sir, I can show to the satisfaction of this House from the terms of that Resolution itself that the Government is in full agreement with us in thinking that the recommendations of the Royal Commission should be wholly laid aside, and that our conclusions, if we have to form any, should be based upon facts quite independent of those recommendations. Now let me for a moment turn to the language of the Resolution. What is said here is that:

"The following recommendations of the Royal Commission on the Superior Civil Services in India be *in principle* approved."

What is the meaning of being approved in principle? What is the principle that this Royal Commission has laid down? We may as well look for a needle in a hay stack as try and find out a principle in the Report of the Royal Commission. It is a string of *ipse dixit*s, a series of bald statements, of inferences and conclusions, supposed to have been arrived at upon evidence which is not before this House. But I will assume that there is a principle in these findings, in these recommendations. If that be so, where is the acceptance of the recommendations themselves? When a recommendation is made and you only accept it in principle, do you accept it in the form in substance or to the full extent it goes? You certainly do not, and that being so, I say, and say with confidence, that there is not a single recommendation of the Royal Commission which has been accepted by the Government as it stands without qualifications and modifications which have not been disclosed and which for aught we know may change the whole face of the Report. The approval *in principle* applies to sub-clauses (a), (b) and (c) of clause (1) as well as clause (2); but when we come to clause (2) we find another word, a tell-tale word. What this House is asked to do is to approve the principle that "pay, passage, concessions and pensions be granted to the officers of the Superior Civil Services in India *approximately* on the scale recommended";

not exactly, but *approximately*. Again in clause (3) we find the same important words in *principle*. The clause runs:

"That the recommendation of the Royal Commission regarding the constitution of Provincial Medical Services in Governors' Provinces be accepted in *principle*."

And this adoption in principle is further diluted by the sub-clauses being subjected to certain conditions.

Now, Sir, if any principle can be deduced from this Report and the recommendations of the Royal Commission, the principle is that the existing Services should be paid more money and that fresh recruits should be better treated than they are at present. Does that fact deserve to be dignified by the name of principle? Was it not known, was it not common knowledge in this country and in England before this galaxy of gentlemen of great intelligence and high position met together and spent five lakhs of the money of the tax-payer to lay it down as a principle? The real fact is that the Government themselves are not desirous to take the recommendations as they stand without qualification, and the whole idea of the Resolution, as I read it—and Sir, I read the lines as well as between the lines, and put upon it the meaning which any man of affairs will put is simply this, in the name of the recommendations of the Royal Commission give us a free hand to do what we please, because anything and everything can be justified as coming under the principle of that Report. Now, Sir, what is the position? As I have said, the people do not want it, and I have shown, the Government cannot accept it in its entirety. The press has pronounced against it, not merely the *Swarajist* press, Sir, but also the press which we all know represents the interests of the Services themselves. In this connection may I be allowed to refer to a short note which appeared only two days ago in the *Pioneer*, that great champion of the officials all over India, and also in England? What does the writer say about this third clause, which was subsequently added to the Resolution of my Honourable friend? He says:

"The Government Resolution to be moved in the Legislative Assembly on Wednesday has been extended by the inclusion of a third clause dealing with the Lee Commission's proposals for the reorganisation of the Medical Services. As we expected, the Government cannot recommend the acceptance of the principle of these proposals without considerable reservation."

So here we have it, that the Government are not prepared to accept even the principle without certain reservations. Then he says:

"For reasons which have been given at some length in the columns of the *Pioneer*, these reservations are most important and will probably require practically a complete review of the whole question involved."

Then the writer proceeds:

"It has long been recognised that the scheme in the light of the present state of recruitment would be quite impracticable. We doubt indeed whether the Government can contemplate the adoption of even a part of the proposals made without further investigation of the whole subject of the Medical Services in India."

Now that may be taken as a fair sample of the views of the press and of the Government as regards the whole of the recommendations of the Royal



Commission. So that we are, Sir, exactly where we were before the Royal Commission came, and that I submit on the showing of the Government themselves.

I will now, with your permission, take the various parts of my amendment, and in dealing with them I shall refer to such points as the Honourable the Home Member has tried to make about some of the clauses. I say in my amendment, "that the recommendations of the Royal Commission on the Superior Civil Services of India be not accepted," and the first reason I give is:

"(a) That the Royal Commission on the Superior Civil Services in India was appointed and allowed to enter upon its functions in utter disregard of Resolutions passed by the first Assembly."

Now, Sir, a few facts, of which the House is probably well aware, are to be borne in mind. I will only give three dates.

On the 26th January, 1923, a motion for adjournment of the House was passed. That motion was made on the decision of His Majesty to appoint this Royal Commission. The motion was carried without a division. Then, on the 17th March of the same year, when the Budget came up for discussion, a motion was made to omit the provision for the expenditure to be incurred on account of this Royal Commission, and that motion also was carried. Lastly, on the 28th March, 10 days later, His Excellency the Governor General in Council restored the grant—not His Excellency the Governor General but the Governor General in Council. Thus the Royal Commission was forced upon the country in spite of the protest of the first Assembly—a protest which was backed by the general feeling and the general opinion in the country and in the press. It is believed that the Government of India themselves were at one time against it. In the report of the debates on this motion I find that my Honourable friend the indomitable Dr. Gour threw out an open challenge to the then Home Member, Sir Malcolm Hailey, to deny that that was the fact, namely, that the Government had at one time expressed their opinion against the appointment of this Commission. Sir Malcolm Hailey, with his usual ability as a skilful fencer in debate, avoided a direct answer to that challenge, but treated the House to a dissertation on the ethics of office and on the etiquette and conventions of men in high office, saying that he would not be tempted, whatever Dr. Gour might say, to give a direct answer. Now, Sir, I was not then a Member of this House, but the report of the proceedings leaves no doubt in my mind on the point. It may be that the Government were not at the time when Dr. Gour put the question and threw out the challenge, against the appointment of the Royal Commission; but there is no doubt that at some time or other they were against it. There was an "ultra-Conservative" Government in England in those days and there was a "reactionary" Secretary of State—the adjectives are not mine, Sir, but were used by Sir Malcolm Hailey himself. There is no doubt that the Government of India had to bend before the will of the Government at Home; and having done so it was but natural for the Governor General in Council to certify the grant which had been refused by the House. Now, Sir, we are asked to swallow all this, to put our seal of approval on these proceedings, and to consider this Report as if it was a Report made by a Commission under

the sanction of this House, and the money spent was the money which this House had allotted for it. I make free to say that if the Government in England, which rode roughshod over the will of the people of India, had now been in power I should certainly have refused even to look at this Report but we know that the present Government and the present Secretary of State are not, either in fact or by any fiction of law or convention, responsible for the action taken by their predecessors. We know also what was stated in the House of Lords in the recent debate and what we are in all sincerity of purpose expected to do by the present Government. It is the present Labour Government and not their predecessors who have invited us to express ourselves upon the merits of this Report, and in common courtesy we are bound to accept their invitation and go into the merits. But I wish to make it perfectly clear that we do not abandon this plea—if I may use the language of law,—this plea is in bar. I rely upon it as a strong reason why the recommendations of the Royal Commission should not be accepted at all.

Now, Sir, in this connection there is another important fact which deserves to be noticed. It is this—that the two great divisions of political thought in India, namely, the Congress, including the Swarajists, and the Liberals, including the Moderates, both pronounced against this procedure and were from the beginning opposed to the constitution of this Royal Commission. The Swarajists and the Congressmen were of course by their very creed unable to take part in the proceedings, but the most remarkable fact is that all the Liberal Associations in the country officially resolved to boycott this Commission, and if a stray Liberal here and there gave his evidence—as I know some did—it was in his own personal capacity—he represented neither his association nor his party nor his country. That being so, I ask what is the value of such a Report, of recommendations which have been arrived at on practically one-sided evidence, of proceedings in which the public, the real masters, had no say at all and the holding of which in itself constituted an insult upon the public? So that, Sir, although we do not reject the Report on that one ground, we do ask His Majesty's Government to give the facts that I have just stated their proper weight, and giving them their proper weight, to do as they would have done if they were in our position. I ask the Labour Government to put themselves in our position and to treat this Report in the manner in which they would have treated it if they had been ignored as we were.

Now, Sir, I will come to the next clause, clause (b) of my amendment, which gives the second reason why the recommendations should not be accepted:

"That all questions affecting the Civil Services are inseparably connected with, and entirely dependent upon, the larger question of the grant of responsible government to India and cannot be entertained and satisfactorily dealt with unless and until the Resolution of this House on responsible government adopted on 18th February 1924, is substantially complied with."

It is impossible to conceive how any Service can be properly organised until we know exactly who will be the master that public servants will have

to serve. Who can tell, before the final settlement of the question of the grant of responsible government to India, what will be the nature of the services required, who will be the persons qualified to enter those Services and what should be the terms upon which those Services are to be recruited? Now, my Honourable friend referred us to certain extracts regarding the position of Services *vis-à-vis* any form of government and he quoted from Professor Ramsay Muir<sup>1</sup> that as regards the carrying on of the daily administration and the enforcement of the existing laws which is nine-tenths of the business of government, this country, *i.e.*, England, was governed by a pure bureaucracy. Now, my Honourable friend will pardon me if I say that he need not have quoted those passages. There is not the least doubt about the principle. No one has ever said in this House or outside it that the carrying on of the daily administration and the enforcement of the existing laws is any part of the duty of this House or will be any part of the duty of the responsible government which may be set up hereafter. But these quotations refer to a different state of things. They refer to a state of things which assumes the employment of a permanent service to instruct the changing Governments which come in and go out from time to time; and in those circumstances you may call the permanent service, it may be, in a sort of vague manner, a bureaucracy. The kind of interference this House claims to be entitled to make, and the responsible government when it is established will be entitled to make, is shown in a book of greater authority than Professor Ramsay Muir's book which was referred to by the Honourable the Home Member, I mean Sidgwick's<sup>2</sup> "Elements of Politics." At page 460 the author says:

"As regards the organisation and management of the whole executive organ it clearly belongs to the Legislature to define the powers of officials and to determine what special privileges or liabilities it may be for the public advantage to allot to or impose on any class of servants of the Government, and generally lay down the conditions of appointment and tenure of executive offices."

Thus, Sir, is what we want. We are not asking to be allowed to interfere from day to day with the actual carrying out of the laws or the policy of Government. We claim the right to lay down that policy and to enforce it, and if public servants would not enforce it, to have the right to exercise our disciplinary jurisdiction over them and to dictate to them from time to time what is their duty. Then Sidgwick goes on to say:

"We have seen that experience alone can determine the degree of minuteness to which the financial control exercised by the Legislature over the

<sup>1</sup>Ramsay Muir; b. 1872, Scholar of Balliol; Lecturer in Modern History, Owens College, Manchester, Lecturer, University of Liverpool, 1900-06, Professor, 1906-13, Professor at University of Manchester, 1913-21; member, Calcutta University Commission, 1917-19, British Parliament, 1923-24; Chairman, National Liberal Federation, 1931-33, its President, 1933-36; author of *Making of British India* and *Nationalism and Inter-nationalism*; d. 1941.

<sup>2</sup>Henry Sidgwick; b. 1838; English Philosopher and author; Fellow, Trinity College, Cambridge, 1859-69, Lecturer, 1859-75; founded the Newnham College, Cambridge, 1871; Professor of moral philosophy, Cambridge University, 1883-1900, d. 1900.

executive should be carried so as to secure the maximum of economy without impairing the general efficiency of the organ or its power of promptly meeting sudden calls for special activity. On the other hand for reasons before given the Legislature should be presented, by law or custom, from interfering in the selection of individuals to fill vacant posts, or in the particular allotment of tasks to them, within the range of business assigned to the department to which they belong.'

That, I take it, Sir, is a correct statement of the law upon the subject and it is for that that we contend. These are more or less matters of elementary learning.

Then, as to the hureaucraey in England, we have got some very descriptive names in English and Colonial law for the permanent service; for instance we have the very expressive word "Mr. Mother country"; a gentleman who is specially versed in the laws of England and the routine work and procedure and whose business is to instruct the Government for the time being, which is generally composed of laymen. I have no objection at all to not only one but a dozen Messrs "Mother country" coming over here and instructing us. Now what is the theoretical relation between the political chief which we aspire to be and the permanent subordinates which the Civil Service must become sooner or later. Here it is:

"The political chief furnishes the lay element in the concern; his function is to bring the administration into harmony with the general sense of the community and especially of Parliament. He must keep it in accord with the views of the majority in the House of Commons and conversely defend it when criticised and protect it against injury by any ill-considered action of the House,"

and so on.

This is from Mr. Lowell's book on the Government of England. I therefore ask whether the policy you are pursuing is a policy which has any relation whatever to the grant of responsible government to the country. It may come to-day, it may come to-morrow, it may come ten years hence; it may come a hundred years hence. This policy is certainly not a policy to lead us to responsible government at any time. Mere substitution of Indian for English public servants has nothing whatever to do with the changes which must necessarily come the moment real power is invested in this Legislature and in the representatives of the people. We do not want simply a brown bureaucracy to be substituted for a white bureaucracy. We want substantial powers in the representatives of the people and, if our white friends would care to stay and take part in our affairs after we have got those powers, we will be very glad to see them as representatives of their community in this House.

I now come to clause (c):

"That the terms of reference to the said Royal Commission and the recommendations made by it involve the perpetuation of an antiquated

<sup>1</sup>Abbott Lawrence Lowell, b. 1856; American political scientist and educator; practised law, Boston, 1880-97; Professor, Harvard University, 1900-09. President of Harvard University, 1909-33; author of *Governments and Parties in Continental Europe* and *The Government of England*; d. 1943.

and anachronic system of public services without any attempt to reconstruct the administrative machinery to suit the present day conditions of India which are widely different from those prevailing when it was inaugurated."

Now, I would like to make it clear to the House that I have nothing to say against the gentlemen who are in the Service at present or who have been in the Service in the past, or even against those who might come into the Service in future. It is the system that I attack and I attack it with all the strength at my command. This system I say is the survival—I will not say of barbarism, but of the conditions of 110 years ago when we were taken as a primitive people and the English Government began to bring us up in the knowledge of citizenship and civic duties. It was in 1813 that the Indian appointments for British youths were reserved for those trained in the Company's College at Haileybury. Since then the system that guarantees the conditions of Service remained practically the same, with this exception that the pays, pensions and allowances were from time to time increased. It is the old *ma-bap* system inaugurated in 1813 which we find in force in the year of grace 1923. (*A Voice*: "1924".) Yes, 1924, one year makes no difference in the life of a nation. What I submit is that we are no longer in the *ma-bap* period and that the *ma-bap* principle will not now help you to govern the country. If you want to be here, if you want to take part in our affairs, it has to be under a *bhai-bhai* system and not a *ma-bap* system. We are willing to treat you as brothers and sisters if you will treat us as brothers and sisters; but no more of your *ma-bapism*.

Well, Sir, as I have already said with reference to the previous clause, it is one thing to improve your Services, it is one thing to make them fit for the growing requirements of the times, but it is quite a different thing to reconstruct your Services and your administrative machinery in accordance with the change in the Government which is bound to come sooner or later. In support of this, I shall, with your leave, Sir, read a few passages from an excellent article which appeared the other day in the *Times of India*. I read it, Sir, because the point I am now making is so well put that I could not have put it better. I adopt it as a part of my argument. Sir, I am again quoting from an Anglo-Indian paper, Anglo-Indian in colour, in spirit and in mind. (*Mr. M.A. Jinnah*: Better than the *Pioneer*). Yes, better than the *Pioneer*. Well, Sir, this is an article which appeared on the 29th of August 1924 and here is the passage that I wish to read. Treating of the administrative foundations of political progress, the writer says:

"The root of the whole difficulty would seem to be that Indian opinion does not believe that the Services, as at present recruited and organised, can fit harmoniously into the scheme of a self-governing India. This appears to raise a question not easily dismissed by the enunciation of commonplace truisms. For reflection shows that the problem has never received adequate examination. There is no gainsaying the fact that while much attention has been devoted during the last few years to the question of political reform and constitutional progress, the reform of the administrative machinery of the country has been very largely neglected. Has any responsible person, either in India or in England, seriously sat down

to think out the kind of Public Services which India really needs, and in consequence to arrive at some estimate as to the extent to which the present staffing and recruitment of the administrative machine really correspond with this desideratum? And yet, on the face of it, there would seem to be very good grounds for such a step. The political and constitutional progress of India is of a kind which is likely at length to assimilate her to those countries in which responsible government obtains. Yet the Public Services of India remain entirely different in type from the Public Services in other countries. Their position is more dignified; their emoluments are incomparably greater."

And then he goes on:

"But are we justified in assuming that these concessions (of pay and allowances) are the due of future entrants, until we have convinced ourselves that the system by which the Public Services are staffed and recruited is what the country really requires? We are not here concerned to raise the question of Indianisation, which has, it will be obvious, an important bearing upon the subject. We desire to take the broadest view. India is rapidly advancing along the lines of political reform; but the system of her Public Services still retains the characteristics of a paternal regime which is now every day vanishing further and further into obsolescence."

One more passage, Sir, before I finish with this:

"There can, of course, be no question of tampering with the rights of the present generation of public servants. But in considering the question of recruitment, the problem we have indicated arises in an acute form. Are we justified, without the most careful and the most meticulous investigation, in perpetuating a regime which took its rise in conditions now long passed away?"

Now, Sir, this is really the case I make in clause (c). It has been put clearly in this article by the writer.

I now go on to clause (d), and shall very briefly deal with it and the remaining clauses as I am afraid I am going beyond my time-limit.

Clause (d) runs:

"That the said terms of reference to the said Royal Commission and the recommendations made by it are based on the unwarranted assumption that the existing system of Government both Central and Provincial and the present position, powers and functions of the Secretary of State, the Governor General and the Governors of Provinces would continue indefinitely."

Now, Sir, there is no doubt that the Royal Commission, while they certainly have in contemplation—as they say at the beginning of their recommendation—the progressive realisation of responsible government in this country, have consciously or unconsciously made recommendations which have the opposite effect, as I shall show presently. But, taking the recommendations as they stand, they come to this that it will take 15 years to bring us to a proportion of 50 per cent of Indians in the Superior Executive Services.

That is to say, in the year 1939, we shall have that proportion, and those who shall have entered in that lucky year will have another 25 years at least of official life to run. The complete Indianisation will thus be delayed for 40

years even if there is no further recruitment in England. But the ratio of 50 per cent is to be kept up even after 15 years by fresh recruitment where it will remain—for how long we do not know; maybe the Greek Kalends.

I was very much pained, Sir, at the reference that was made by the Honourable the Home Member to the phrase "mercenary hordes" which he said had been used to describe the British Services. I do not know if he heard it in this House or elsewhere, but so far as my information goes no Honourable Member in this House has ever permitted himself to use that expression.

I am very glad to hear that. I cannot think of any Honourable Member of this House referring to the Services, and especially the British Services, as hordes of mercenaries. The whole point is this, that the Services generally are an anachronism at the present day; and I take the liberty to say of my Honourable friend the Home Member that he himself is an anachronism, a very costly anachronism. But no Member of this House has ever said anything whatever against the actual discharge of the duties by the British element of the Services as a whole. They are not wanted because their continuance in the present condition of things is not consistent with the progress that has already been made or will be made in future.

Now, Sir, I come to clause (e) which runs as follows:

"That some of the recommendations of the Royal Commission are intended to deprive the Legislatures even of their existing powers by suggesting devices to transfer items of expenditure hitherto subject to the vote of the Assembly and the Provincial Councils to the head of non-votable items".

That is a matter which has not been dealt with by my Honourable friend. I refer in this clause to the recommendations made in respect of passages in paragraphs 36, 37, 64 and 65 and also to the Provident Fund contributions dealt with in paragraph 87 and to the re-appointment by the Secretary of State of officers already appointed by the Government of India so as to have the benefit of non-votable salaries.

Paragraphs 36 and 37, and 64 and 65. Provident Fund Contributions—paragraph 86. Re-appointment of officers, paragraph 89. Now, Sir, it is often necessary for the the best of objects and from the best of motives to resort to devices. But when a device is intended to curtail the liberty of the people—such scant liberty as has been allowed to them—you cannot expect them to applause either the object or the motive. What have the Royal Commission done? In respect of passages their recommendations come to this:

"We recommend that officers are entitled to passages. But we know that passages are subject to the vote of the Assembly. We do not want this new-fangled Assembly or the Provincial Legislatures to have at their mercy these officers for whom passages are essential. We therefore say this, that although it is an allowance for passages, although it is no part of their pay, although they are not entitled to spend it as they would their own pay, yet in spite of all this call it pay, add it to their pay, and say that it is pay, and then, when it is time for the Accountant-General

to pay it is not to be paid to the officer. It is to be paid into a special fund called the 'Passage Fund' and kept apart, and when the particular officer requires a passage, it is then to be paid to him as passage money."

It comes to this that passage is an allowance; it remains all along a passage allowance; it is paid as passage allowance; it is not drawn as pay, but simply to take it away from the vote of the Assembly or the Councils they say there is no harm in calling it pay although it never was intended to be any part of the pay.

This applies also to the Providential Fund—I mean Provident Fund—I wish it were Providential for in that case it would be no burden on India.

Then we come to the reappointment of officers. There are certain officers appointed in England by the Secretary of State. There are certain others who are appointed by the Government of India. The officers appointed by the Secretary of State are not under our control as regards pay and allowances. With regard to those appointed here, their pay and allowances are subject to the vote of the Assembly or the Councils. There is nothing easier than to ask the Secretary of State to reappoint these men, in order that these men may get out of the clutches of the Assembly, and the Royal Commission have recommended accordingly. This is how we are expected to advance step by step to responsible government.

The next paragraph of my amendment deals with racial discriminations and runs:

"(f) That the said recommendations have introduced racial discriminations in the treatment of the All-India Services."

I shall run somewhat hurriedly through this and the remaining paragraphs and shall simply explain what I mean. In passage concessions there is racial discrimination. That is to say, the concession is to be given only to officers of non-Asiatic domicile. There is racial discrimination also in remittance privileges and the Indian Medical Service, where medical assistance is recommended to be given to Europeans on a racial basis. My friends who will follow me will deal with these subjects more in detail. I shall also for the present pass over the clause which deals with medical service. There are some of my medical friends here who understand the position better than I do and they will place their views before this House.

I now come to the last clause, that the inquiry held by the Royal Commission has been unsatisfactory in that the bulk of the evidence on which the Report is based was taken in camera and no material is referred to or made available to the Assembly. I might have added that they have not even divulged the names of the witnesses, and we do not know what class of people were examined. Now, Sir, this has been passed over very lightly by my Honourable friend. It is a matter to which I attach the greatest importance. A Royal Commission is in its very nature a public tribunal intended to hold a public inquiry. I am surprised that my Honourable friend said that the terms of reference to the Royal Commission did not include an authority or a direction to publish the evidence. I do not think that the terms of reference to any Royal Commission need contain such a direction, because it is in the very nature of things, in the very nature of its constitution, in the very nature of the inquiry



it is to hold, that evidence should be recorded in public, except perhaps in cases where there are special reasons for not recording it in public; for instance, there may be one, two or more witnesses examined in camera, to avoid State secrets from being divulged. What is most suprising is that a string of recommendations is placed before us and we are asked to accept it as it stands. As regards the passage and other allowances, there is absolutely no reason given for allowing them and there is absolutely no evidence cited to support them, yet the Government of India have by some intuition or inspiration come to know that the recommendations are quite necessary. The only reason now given is that the members of the Royal Commission were all for allowing them. Now, Sir, if that were any test, I think it will save a great deal of public money if we abolished all the Appellate Courts in the country and simply appointed honourable men as Judges of Courts of first instance and made their judgments final for all time to come. I have never heard, Sir, that any person, however high, whatever his position, however great his attainments, can take shelter under his ability or attainments when called upon to support his conclusions by the evidence that he may have taken. But here again, I have something to tell the House which will perhaps surprise Honourable Members. It has been stated that this inquiry in camera was conducted in deference to the wishes of the witnesses, and at page 61 of the Report it is stated:

"In our view it was of paramount importance that, to guide us in our investigation, we should be able to ascertain the genuine opinions of witnesses on the matters at issue, however confidential or controversial the latter might be. There were likely to be many witnesses, Indian as well as European, who would shrink from expressing, in public, opinions which they conscientiously held but which if published in the Press might involve them in political controversy. Had the Commission decided that it would hear no evidence which was not given in public,"—*nobody ever expected any Commission to decide that*—"witnesses of this kind—who as it proved were by no means the most vehement in their tone or the most extreme in their demands—would, to a large extent, have declined to speak freely."

Then, the Report goes on to say:

"That if a witness decided to be heard in public, representatives of the Press were admitted to record his oral evidence, and received his written statement as well."

Then again:

"The record shows that, of the 411 witnesses who gave oral evidence, only 152 elected to be heard in public."

Now, Sir, let us test these statements. I shall rely for my facts on another newspaper of equal standing in the official world in another presidency as the "Pioneer" and the "Times of India" are in the United Provinces and Bombay, respectively: I mean the *Madras Mail*. The writer is a gentleman who, although he has not disclosed his identity, is evidently a member of the Civil Service as the facts that he gives clearly show. He says:

"One Service Association sent in its memorial and appointed some of its members to give evidence. Before the arrival of the Commission in

Madras, the Secretary of the Association received a wire from the Secretary of the Commission asking whether the Association desired to give evidence in public or in camera. In public was the reply. When the Commission arrived in Madras and on the day before the evidence of the Association was to be taken, the Secretary of the Association received a request from the Secretary of the Commission by telephone asking him to apply for the Association's evidence to be taken in camera. It was too late for the Secretary to consult the general body of members, and as a definite request had been made by the Commission, the Secretary and those members of the Association who could be consulted agreed to send an application that the evidence should be taken in camera. After the application had been sent several members protested strongly but the step had been taken and nothing could be done."

Then he says:

"One of the two service representatives had put in a memorial which dealt candidly and faithfully with the question of the retention of the European Services and the Commission were anxious not to examine him on his memorial in public. The outcome of the matter was that the evidence of the service representative was taken in camera so far as it related to the joint memorial, but"—and now comes the important part—"the representative who had submitted independent views as a reply to the first interrogative, declined to be examined on the independent memorial in camera and after some deliberation, the Commission decided not to examine him at all."

It is clear that the writer speaks with knowledge that no one outside that particular association could possibly possess. The communication to the press was made with quite a different object, and not the object for which I am utilising it. What the writer says is: "It is true that the Royal Commission failed to take evidence in the proper way. But it is not our fault. It is not the fault of the Services, and there is no reason why those Services should suffer." And he points out that they took every precaution to see that their evidence was taken as publicly as possible. But is there now, Sir, after knowing these facts, any justification for saying that the witnesses—some of them bank men and some commercial men—were so very nervous of giving their evidence in public that the Royal Commission was obliged to hear them in camera. How far is the claim of my Honourable friend that we have been treated very well sustainable after this? Now, Sir, these are the reasons; they are not exhaustive but they are the reasons on which we ask the House not to identify itself with any part of the recommendations of the Commission and not to accept any one of those recommendations. Then we go on to make constructive proposals, proposals which suggest the measures that were indicated in the article of the *Times of India* on which I relied for the reconstruction of the administrative machinery to suit it for the present day needs of the country. My Honourable friend has referred to the question which the Commissioners put to themselves. He referred to page 18 of the Report where it is stated "In the days of the Islington Commission the question was how many Indians should be admitted into the public services?" It has now become "what is the minimum number of Englishmen which must still be recruited?" My Honourable friend further

it is to hold, that evidence should be recorded in public, except perhaps in cases where there are special reasons for not recording it in public; for instance, there may be one, two or more witnesses examined in camera, to avoid State secrets from being divulged. What is most suprising is that a string of recommendations is placed before us and we are asked to accept it as it stands. As regards the passage and other allowances, there is absolutely no reason given for allowing them and there is absolutely no evidence cited to support them, yet the Government of India have by some intuition or inspiration come to know that the recommendations are quite necessary. The only reason now given is that the members of the Royal Commission were all for allowing them. Now, Sir, if that were any test, I think it will save a great deal of public money if we abolished all the Appellate Courts in the country and simply appointed honourable men as Judges of Courts of first instance and made their judgments final for all time to come. I have never heard, Sir, that any person, however high, whatever his position, however great his attainments, can take shelter under his ability or attainments when called upon to support his conclusions by the evidence that he may have taken. But here again, I have something to tell the House which will perhaps surprise Honourable Members. It has been stated that this inquiry in camera was conducted in deference to the wishes of the witnesses, and at page 61 of the Report it is stated:

"In our view it was of paramount importance that, to guide us in our investigation, we should be able to ascertain the genuine opinions of witnesses on the matters at issue, however confidential or controversial the latter might be. There were likely to be many witnesses, Indian as well as European, who would shrink from expressing, in public, opinions which they conscientiously held but which if published in the Press might involve them in political controversy. Had the Commission decided that it would hear no evidence which was not given in public,"—*nobody ever expected any Commission to decide that*—"witnesses of this kind—who as it proved were by no means the most vehement in their tone or the most extreme in their demands—would, to a large extent, have declined to speak freely."

Then, the Report goes on to say:

"That if a witness decided to be heard in public, representatives of the Press were admitted to record his oral evidence, and received his written statement as well."

Then again:

"The record shows that, of the 411 witnesses who gave oral evidence, only 152 elected to be heard in public."

Now, Sir, let us test these statements. I shall rely for my facts on another newspaper of equal standing in the official world in another presidency as the "Pioneer" and the "Times of India" are in the United Provinces and Bombay, respectively: I mean the *Madras Mail*. The writer is a gentleman who, although he has not disclosed his identity, is evidently a member of the Civil Service as the facts that he gives clearly show. He says:

"One Service Association sent in its memorial and appointed some of its members to give evidence. Before the arrival of the Commission in

been allowed in England and in other countries. One of the reasons why the Royal Commission is prepared to recommend this permanent enhancement of salaries is that in India the Services were not given war honours. By all means give them something which is temporary. The Royal Commission is satisfied that a case had been made out for a permanent increase in the salaries. But how can you ask us to commit ourselves to an expenditure without satisfying ourselves that that is a proper expenditure and therefore must be incurred from the tax-payer's point of view?

Now, Sir, there is one paragraph in the preamble which I should have noticed. One can understand the grievances of those who have become grey in the Service—men who entered the Service and built high hopes, which hopes were frustrated for some reason or other beyond their control and beyond the control of the Government. But what about the fresh recruits? What about those who entered after 1919 with their eyes wide open as to what they may expect, what they may not expect; who knew that the Government of India Act had been passed and that the country was bound to have a transitional period short or long. Even taking the Government of India Act as it stands, the very least that these gentlemen who entered the Services in 1919 should have known and must have known was that they would be subject to all the vicissitudes which are mentioned here as reasons for giving them increases. It will be insulting their intelligence to say that they did not take that factor into consideration. Are young Englishmen educated in English Universities unable to understand the simple fact that after the passing of the Government of India Act, it may any day happen that from the reserved field of service they may be transferred to the transferred field of service and after being so transferred will be subject to the vote of the Council or the Assembly, as the case may be. If they knew that—and I submit that there can be no reason whatever to think that they did not—then what reason is there to provide for allowances and advancements of salaries on that ground?

Now, Sir, I shall not detain the House at any greater length. But I may be allowed frankly and candidly to say what is the general feeling about this Royal Commission Report. The recommendations of the Royal Commission purport to be a part of the great scheme inaugurated by the Government of India Act in 1919 to enable the country eventually to govern itself by gradually eliminating the European element from the administration. The Act itself was ushered in with a flourish of trumpets, as a remarkable piece of legislation. It was claimed for it that it was a new departure in the art of governing subject races whereby the Governors were giving to the governed, voluntarily, and in the interests of mankind in general, the right to govern themselves. Now, Sir, in the course of giving that right this Royal Commission was thought of as a necessary step. It was said that as India was progressively being entitled to responsible government something must be done to bring the Services into line with the conditions now prevailing and those which will prevail shortly in the country. What happened? It was a great gift, if it was all that was claimed for it, but as the House is aware, there were some cynical people in the population of India who for the very reason that it was a most remarkable thing which had ever been done in the history of the world, looked askance at the Reforms, at the Act itself. They did the very ungrateful thing to examine

said that that showed the march of events and the progress that the country had made. If I may be permitted to formulate a question of my own, it will run something like this. "Is there any reason whatever why any European at all should be retained in this country unless their services were required as experts or because they possessed special technical knowledge?" That is the standard which should be applied. I do not say that this means that the European Service should be abolished. No. I say that the standard of qualification for service in India should be [fixed] not because a certain proportion has to be retained, but because a certain kind of work has to be done for which the Europeans are especially qualified. Then I will be the last person in the world to share the suspicions of those to whom my Honourable friend was referring when he said that the services were supposed to come out here for their own selfish ends. The Honourable the Home Member then refuted this imaginary charge by referring to the small number of recruits that come out to India every year and said: "Can that state of recruitment mean that these people have selfish ends of their own?" Now, I must say that everybody who takes up a service for remuneration has a selfish motive and selfish end to serve quite apart from his public duties. But I do not wish to say that these hard-worked gentlemen who come here, so far away from their native country, and who work honestly do so only for selfish reasons. Of course, there is a selfish element in the most unselfish work of which you can conceive. Nobody will deny that. But it is quite a different thing to say that a public servant comes out to this country with selfish motives. The selfish motives with which we charge the British Government lie elsewhere—not in the motives of the Services but in the motives which lie behind the maintenance of the Services. The selfish reason, however, is the maintenance of the grip over India for all time to come. That is the selfish reason. It is not that ten, twenty or a hundred young men from England should come out here every year and be provided for. No, certainly not. What we mean by selfish motives is that you are entering into our daily life day by day to such an extent that it will take—I do not know how long it will be—hundreds of years for us to shake ourselves free of you. What we want is that you should give us the right to walk erect in our streets and then you can come in any numbers you like. Come as our friends, come as our neighbours, not as our rulers.

Then I come to Part II of my amendment, which speaks for itself. We have made our position fairly clear. We have said that we will not accept anything until we are satisfied that the recommendations of the Royal Commission upon that point are correct; and, in order to satisfy us, we must have the materials that the Royal Commission had or any other materials which are likely to satisfy us. We are not sticking to the nature of the materials or the evidence. How can you expect anyone whom you ask to give money for a certain purpose to be prepared to give that money unless and until he has satisfied himself that the money is required and that he can afford it? We cannot accept the *obiter dictum* of the Royal Commission that a certain amount is fair. We must have the materials before us. One argument used in favour of this huge expenditure is the rise in prices. Where in the world have the prices not risen? Where in the world have permanent increases of salaries been given on account of the rise in prices? We know that war bonuses have

been allowed in England and in other countries. One of the reasons why the Royal Commission is prepared to recommend this permanent enhancement of salaries is that in India the Services were not given war bonuses. By all means give them something which is temporary. The Royal Commission is satisfied that a case had been made out for a permanent increase in the salaries. But how can you ask us to commit ourselves to an expenditure without satisfying ourselves that that is a proper expenditure and therefore must be incurred from the tax-payer's point of view?

Now, Sir, there is one paragraph in the preamble which I should have noticed. One can understand the grievances of those who have become grey in the Service—men who entered the Service and built high hopes, which hopes were frustrated for some reason or other beyond their control and beyond the control of the Government. But what about the fresh recruits? What about those who entered after 1919 with their eyes wide open as to what they may expect, what they may not expect; who knew that the Government of India Act had been passed and that the country was bound to have a transitional period short or long. Even taking the Government of India Act as it stands, the very least that these gentlemen who entered the Services in 1919 should have known and must have known was that they would be subject to all the vicissitudes which are mentioned here as reasons for giving them increases. It will be insulting their intelligence to say that they did not take that factor into consideration. Are young Englishmen educated in English Universities unable to understand the simple fact that after the passing of the Government of India Act, it may any day happen that from the reserved field of service they may be transferred to the transferred field of service and after being so transferred will be subject to the vote of the Council or the Assembly, as the case may be. If they knew that—and I submit that there can be no reason whatever to think that they did not—then what reason is there to provide for allowances and advancements of salaries on that ground?

Now, Sir, I shall not detain the House at any greater length. But I may be allowed frankly and candidly to say what is the general feeling about this Royal Commission Report. The recommendations of the Royal Commission purport to be a part of the great scheme inaugurated by the Government of India Act in 1919 to enable the country eventually to govern itself by gradually eliminating the European element from the administration. The Act itself was ushered in with a flourish of trumpets, as a remarkable piece of legislation. It was claimed for it that it was a new departure in the art of governing subject races whereby the Governors were giving to the governed, voluntarily, and in the interests of mankind in general, the right to govern themselves. Now, Sir, in the course of giving that right this Royal Commission was thought of as a necessary step. It was said that as India was progressively being entitled to responsible government something must be done to bring the Services into line with the conditions now prevailing and those which will prevail shortly in the country. What happened? It was a great gift, if it was all that was claimed for it, but as the House is aware, there were some cynical people in the population of India who for the very reason that it was a most remarkable thing which had ever been done in the history of the world, looked askance at the Reforms, at the Act itself. They did the very ungrateful thing to examine

a gift horse in the mouth, but no sooner did they do it they found it was a wooden horse! The most venturesome of the cynical people I have referred to above refused to ride that wooden horse, and made up their minds to set out in right earnest to win the real horse, or lose the saddle. The less venturesome tried to ride it; they rode it; they shook themselves violently on it but it was so fixed to a steel frame underneath that it refused to rock. They had in their disappointment to ask that the steel frame may be a little loosened, so as to give some little play to this wooden horse. That request of theirs was listened to; a Royal Commission was appointed; Indianisation was promised; but, what was it that was done? To carry the metaphor a little further, some screws and nails were taken from the front and fixed behind this machinery. The result was that it remained as immovable as ever. The result is that they have not even a rocking horse to give them an opportunity to acquire the necessary grip for riding a real horse. Now, Sir, I know my friends opposite think that all this suspicion, all this distrust, is without foundation; but look at the things that are being done from day to day, and what do they come to? They come to this that the British Government are trying to stave off the evil day as long as they can; the evil day when full responsible government will be granted to this country; and meanwhile, for fear lest the day may come sooner than they imagine, what are they doing? They are sinking their foundations deeper and deeper, so that when the day really comes they may have practically nothing to hand over to the next Government, and all that matters may remain in the possession of vested interests. That really is the feeling in this country, and as I have said there is justification for it. I will not go further than this that the history of the past few years since 1919 fully justifies an apprehension of that character. I appeal, therefore, to this House not to encourage that feeling by accepting the recommendations of this Commission, but to throw them out in their entirety. I think I have, by the indulgence of the Honourable the President and this House, given fully my reasons for asking the House to do so.

288. *The Hindu Religious and Charitable Trusts Bill, 16 September 1924*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru: I had no intention to intervene in this debate because I did not anticipate any of the objections that have been raised to this Bill being sent to the Select Committee. I do not think I need either make out that I am an orthodox Hindu or to make a confession that I am not an orthodox Hindu. I feel that I am entitled to participate in this debate for another reason and that reason is that I happen to be one of the beneficiaries of these trusts, though never contemplated by the authors of the trusts to be such a beneficiary. What I mean is this, that I have been concerned in my professional capacity with a large number of these trusts and a considerable portion of the trust funds has from time to time come into my pocket. I am therefore in one sense entitled to speak with some authority but at the same

<sup>1</sup>*The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. IV, Part V, 3rd September to 16th September 1924, Simla, 1924, pp. 3513-14.*

time, Sir, I feel that I shall not be justified in indulging in any breach of professional confidence. I shall not relate to the House certain facts and incidents which are fresh in my memory but I shall say this that I cannot understand how any provision of this Bill can be taken to affect the religion of the Hindus or their religious sentiments. All that the Bill proposes to do is to have a register of these properties and to ask these gentlemen who are in charge of these very large properties to keep an account. Now, so far as the principle goes we have a section in the Code of Civil Procedure (section 92) which gives the court jurisdiction to go into these matters and which gives the public the right to bring an administration suit under the conditions provided by that section. That being so, I do not see what greater inroad this Bill can make into the religious sentiments and feelings of the Hindu public. A public trust is a public trust, whether the object is religious, moral or charitable and whenever there is a public trust in any country affecting any community, it is the business of the State to see that it is properly administered. I shall not go into the provisions of the Bill and shall not say how far it deserves to be modified in the Select Committee but confine myself to the fact that there is a strong case made out for its being referred to the Select Committee. There can be no possible doubt as to that.

Now, it has been stated that this is a reform which ought to come from within. I ask Honourable Members of this House how is it possible for the Hindu society, even if it could agree unanimously upon this point, to compel any *mahant* to keep proper accounts, unless there is legislation on the subject. There are certain things which without encroaching upon the domains of social life can only be accomplished by legislation and this is one of those things. I fail to see how else it is possible by any means whatever to see to the proper administration of these funds which are called religious funds. Now it will be said that an action at law is permissible. I agree but it will be the courts who will compel the execution of the trust in a proper and fit manner. What does Dr. Gour's Bill aim at? It aims at simply this, that if occasion arises for any member of the public to avail of the right which he undoubtedly possesses at this moment without Dr. Gour's Bill the courts will be in a better position to give their decision and the public would be in a better position to avail of the assistance of the courts in these matters if the Bill is passed into law. The facts would be there. The accounts would be there. The list of the property will be there and it will be far easier in those circumstances to know whether there has been a breach of trust or not. As it is, I know whenever there is a case of breach of trust the decision more often than not is that there is no breach of trust simply because all the facts cannot be placed before the court. The first plea is that section 539 which was the old section or the present section 92 does not apply. If the fortunate trustee is able to show that that section has no application, no further steps can be taken against him but if he does come within section 92 there is often no material before the court or under the control of the party to enable the court to do justice. Some of the trustees do keep accounts of a sort. Others do not keep any accounts.

That there are no cases of breach of trust, I think it will take a bold man to assert. For these reasons I submit that false issues have been raised upon this very, very simple Bill and questions of religious belief and religious sentiment



have been mixed up with what is purely a civil right and the right of the whole Hindu public. I would therefore strongly support the motion of Dr. Gour, though I may add that if I can be excused from serving on the Select Committee I shall be very glad. Dr. Gour has got so many able men there already. I quite agree with the Honourable gentleman who said that the great majority of the persons on the Committee should be orthodox members. I do not claim to be orthodox in the common sense in which orthodoxy is understood, though I do not yield to any one in this House or outside in being as good a Hindu, as good a Brahmin as any other.

289. *The Indian Criminal Law Amendment (Repealing) Bill, 16 September 1924*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, I do not intend to make a speech. I take part in this debate simply with the object of uttering a warning—a two-fold warning, a warning to the House and a warning to the Government. My Honourable friend, Sir Chimanlal Setalvad, has just concluded a very able criticism of the Act based upon the language and the lack of safeguards. Let me clear the ground at the very outset by saying that I strongly dissent with the milk and water substitute that he has suggested to the Government. Even if the Government are prepared to accept his suggestion, I hope the House will not agree to it. Now, the warning that I wish to give to the House is this, be not led away by the plausible argument which has been addressed to you by my Honourable friend, the Home Member. What does that argument come to? The wonder is that it has been advanced seriously in a House composed as this is. He says that the ordinary law is not sufficient. Now, please analyse this; what does it mean? What is ordinary law and what is extraordinary law? What is a special law? What is an emergency law? In order to answer any of these descriptions they must in the first instance be laws. You cannot have something which has no claim to be recognised as law to be called an extraordinary or a special law to meet an emergency. It comes to this. When a confession of this kind is made by the Government, namely, that the ordinary law is not sufficient to meet the exigencies of the case, it really means that we have failed in the art of government, that we cannot govern you any longer and therefore we must—what? administer the law strictly? No. We must be permitted to break the law in the name of the law. Here are anarchists. We are sorry to confess that we cannot catch them—we cannot stop them—we cannot annihilate them. What are we to do? We do not know what and how to do it under the law. The magnificent system of law and jurisprudence which has been handed down in England from generation to generation and which is the just pride of the England of to-day, is insufficient for us to meet the requirements of the case. What then is to be done? Obviously this, against one set of law-breakers you must by giving us authority to

<sup>1</sup> *The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. IV, Part V, 3rd September to 16th September 1924, Simla, 1924, pp. 3540-44, 3556.*

break the law create a set of licensed law-breakers. That is what it comes to. What is meant by the insufficiency of the ordinary law? Is there any crime, any conceivable thing that law, if it can claim to be law, cannot and does not anticipate? And what does this insufficiency of the ordinary law consist in? It consists in the inability to find evidence to convince any honest man that a particular man is guilty. That is the insufficiency. Well, I say if you are unable to deal with a case under the law, under the magnificent system of law which prevails in England and which you have imported into this country, you must at once confess that you have no business to be in this country and give up all your pretensions to rule us as a subject race.

Then, the Honourable the Home Member says "Oh give us a substitute for the ordinary law." Now, the ordinary law has sometimes failed in other countries too. What is the substitute resorted to? I can understand that, if things go from bad to worse, the ordinary law is suspended and you institute martial law or something of that nature for a time. But I cannot understand the ordinary law to go on side by side with the extraordinary procedure subversive of all laws that was laid down in this Act. And then, please note what the argument comes to. My learned friend will excuse me if I say that all arguments so far advanced in support of this Part of the Act are mere pretences, mere camouflage, to keep it in force not for the purpose alleged but to meet quite a different set of circumstances which has arisen in the past and may arise in the future; not the conditions which really obtain in Bengal but those which may arise anywhere in India. Why do I say that? Will anyone in this House tell me how is Part II of this Act, which still is the only Part in force to be applied against any conspiracy, any anarchical movement? What is to be done under it to deal with such a movement? The part of the Act which really did apply to these movements was Part I which has already been repealed. Part II deals with unlawful associations, whether you know their names or not. And what do you do? The Government issue a notification that such and such an association is an unlawful association. Is it possible to conceive that any anarchical association, any secret society, will ever be known to the Government in that sense and the Government will issue a notification against that society? Has it ever been done? Can you conceive, can any practical man conceive, that a secret society will act in such a manner that the Government will be able to issue a notification? And, if the Government are not able to issue a notification what happens? Why anarchical crime is committed. And when it is once committed, you have to catch the offender just as you would any other offender, whether this Act is applicable or is not applicable, whether it is in force or is not in force. The whole argument of my learned friend is based upon the list of outrages which have recently happened in Bengal. I put it to him and to every Member of this House to tell me, how any of those outrages could have been stopped by the application of Part II. If a man is caught red-handed or if he is subsequently traced and put on his trial and if Part I were in force he could have been dealt with under that Part, but I say again that Part II has absolutely no reference to a case of the kind that has been mentioned. Well, then, what is the substitute for this law which should be adopted in a case like this? What is first of all the evil which has to be removed? The substitute for the Act will, of course, be the remedy for that evil. The evil is

it our business to awaken the people to a knowledge of their real rights, to inform them how they are misgoverned and to demand that they should be governed by themselves. That is the danger of it.

I do not wish to detain the House any further. I will only say that this Act is a most outrageous law. It is a blot upon that magnificent system I have referred to above. It is a blot upon the English nation and upon British character. I will say one thing before I sit down and it is this. If this law continues in force and if this law is applied in my own provinces or if a notification is issued in provinces to which this law applies, I shall take it to be my highest duty to break the law myself and to call upon others to break it.

290. *On the Death of Bhupendra Nath Basu, 16 September 1924<sup>1</sup>*

I associate myself with the remarks which have fallen from the previous speakers. Mr. Basu was one of our very old comrades in arms, and although he was separated from us for a series of years while he held office we all had the highest esteem for him. I sincerely regret his loss.

291. *Substitution of Economic for Taxation Inquiry Committee, 22 September 1924<sup>2</sup>*

Pandit Motilal Nehru: The statement that the amendment represents the consensus of any part of the House is to be taken with reservation and I am prepared to move a slight amendment to the amendment which has been handed to the Chair by my friend Mr. Jinnah. Upon my amendment I claim there is a consensus in this House. It is this. Where my friend Mr. Jinnah says that the Committee is to be appointed in consultation with the leaders of the House, I wish to substitute that the Committee should be appointed by the House. On that point I would refer to the proposal contained in Mr. Goswami's amendment, that is to say, that one-third was to be appointed by the Government and two-thirds appointed by the House. As Mr. Goswami explained in the course of his speech the idea was that there should be one-third of the Members of this Committee which was to consist of experts and two-thirds of persons who had the confidence of the country. That met the objection which was advanced from the Government benches as to the special technical knowledge required for the members of this Committee. I do not think, Sir, that this House will allow any Committee to be appointed in the appointment of which it has no voice, it may be one-third or two-thirds or a smaller proportion of the full Committee. I do not know if my friend Mr. Jinnah is now prepared to accept it but so far as I have been able to gather from the preliminary conversation we had, he and I have, I think, agreed to differ on this point. I do not see why I should concede that point unless it is

<sup>1</sup>The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. IV, Part V, 3rd September to 16th September, 1924, Simla, 1924, p. 3556.

<sup>2</sup>The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. IV, Part V, 17th September to 24th September 1924, Simla, 1924, pp. 3945-46, 3953.

the wish of the House that I should do so and I therefore beg you, Sir (I do not want to make a speech), to put this proposition to the House.

My amendment is that the Governor General in Council should appoint one-third experts and this House will appoint two-thirds. I have not got a copy of Mr. Jinnah's amendment with me.

May I rise to a point of explanation? I am told that in my absence the Honourable the Finance Member was pleased to express a hope that he would find me in the Government lobby. I want to make my position quite clear. The amendment which was moved by Mr. Jinnah had my full concurrence and acceptance, except as to one little part; and if I had been allowed to put it I should have liked to take the decision of the House; but Mr. Jinnah's amendment is the next best thing to what I wanted and I am afraid therefore my Honourable friend will not have the pleasure of seeing me in the Government lobby.

292. *The Indian Criminal Law Amendment (Repealing) Bill, 23 September 1924*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru: As I have been honoured by the Honourable Mr. Tonkinson<sup>2</sup> by his references to me more than once in the course of his speech, I think it is but fair to me and to him that I should be allowed to trespass on the patience of the House for a few minutes. I have often had the misfortune of being misrepresented by the opposing Counsel in law courts and of having my argument so twisted as to be used in support of his argument. But the manner in which the Honourable Mr. Tonkinson has persuaded himself to believe that he has the support of my own argument for his case is, to say the least of it, most surprising. He says that I gave my opinion as to what the present condition of the country was and as to what it may become, and in those circumstances he says it will be very unwise for the Government to throw away the weapon that they have. Now, Sir, the whole drift of my speech on the second reading of this Bill was that it was the Government who was responsible for these associations; that it was the Government that had brought them into existence, and that if you do not mend your ways, you may be sure that one fine morning you will wake up to find the whole country a honeycomb of secret societies. That was my argument. I said you were standing on the edge of a precipice. Have a care, one false step will hurl you many fathoms down into the abyss. Mr. Tonkinson says that on my own showing it is for the Government not only to stand on the brink of the abyss but also to dash down into it. He is welcome to use my argument in that way.

The fact that you have not been able to touch the associations that you

<sup>1</sup>*The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. IV, Part VI, 17th September to 24th September, 1924, Simla, 1924, pp. 3992-94.*

<sup>2</sup>Harry Tonkinson; b. 1880; Under Secretary to Government of Burma, 1910; member, Burma Legislative Council, 1919; Secretary to Government of Burma, 1919; Joint Secretary to Government of India, Home Department, 1922; member, Indian Legislative Assembly 1922, Commissioner, Burma, 1927; d. 1937.

are afraid of, namely, the anarchical associations, under this Part of the Act and the fact that you cannot possibly touch them, were my reasons for asking you to desist from keeping this law any longer on the Statute-book. I asked the Honourable the Home Member at the time when he was talking of this law as a weapon how the weapon was proposed to be used. He said in effect what the Honourable Mr. Tonkinson has said to-day, namely, that by suppressing such associations at an early stage he would prevent them from ripening into anarchical associations. Mr. Tonkinson has now said that the law may be applied to waverers. Now, Sir, that is a very dangerous proposition and one which we should examine further. How are we to know who are the waverers, and how is the law to deal with waverers? I think the only law to meet a contingency like the one contemplated by the Honourable Mr. Tonkinson would be one enabling you to take charge of all the young men in the country whose minds are beginning to be imbued with patriotic ideas, who begin to think of their country, and of their lot in it, who are wavering between joining an anarchical movement and doing what they can for their country in other ways. The only law which will meet a case like that would be a law if you can have it passed in this House or any other, enabling you to take charge of all the young men in the country to see that they may not develop at a later stage into anarchists. Then the Honourable Member referred to one class of criminals, the Congress volunteers. The line upon which they stood was that one false step would lead them to anarchy. The right step, which of course would be the application of the Act, would make them very good citizens. These volunteers were Congress volunteers. What did they object to? They objected to any encroachment on the very natural and elementary right of association which this Act denied to them. They were a determined set of people—there was no wavering there. They went to jail in their thousands and in their tens of thousands by breaking this very law, knowing fully what they were doing, and determined to do it again if occasion arose. Can you call them waverers? They did it, and there were so many of them who followed this course that you were not able to send them all to jail. To do that you would have to convert the whole of this country into an enormous jail. Well, then, what is this weapon for? As Mr. Jinnah has said, and as I have shown in my remarks on the second reading of this Bill, you cannot possibly touch any real anarchical society. I hope I have disposed of the argument, so far as it deals with waverers.

hands of the Executive what is the province of the Judiciary. I say with confidence that there is no law of this kind in any civilized country, there never has been and never can be any such law in a civilized country in normal times, namely, in times like these. When I say "normal times" I distinguish such times from those when it becomes necessary to enforce martial law. In such times there may be any number of secret societies, and conspiracies. It is for the ordinary law to deal with them. There can be no other law which leaves it entirely in the hands of the Executive to decide whether a particular association is unlawful or not. But once a court of law holds that a particular association is an unlawful assembly, there are the provisions of the ordinary law to deal with that association. You do not want a special Act for it. The real sting of this Act lies in the fact that you rob the judiciary of its proper function and invest the Executive with a power which it does not and should not possess in any country. That was my point, Sir. As for the reputation of this House, well, I do not know how much of it is left in the minds of my friends opposite. I think it was the weakest reed for my Honourable friend to rely upon. The reputation of this House is that it has pledged itself to the repeal of all repressive laws. That this is a repressive law can admit of no doubt. The House will only justify its traditions and its reputation if it passes this Bill.

293. *The Bengal Criminal Law Amendment Ordinance, 5 February 1925*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, I rise to support the Resolution moved by my Honourable friend Mr. Duraiswami Aiyangar. In doing so I do not propose to trouble the House with well-established rules, applicable to the primary duties of the State to protect the elementary rights of the people, even under the most difficult of conditions. Enough has been said on that subject in this Chamber, in the press and from hundreds of platforms. To my mind arguments based upon those principles beg the whole question. I say so because I recognise the utter futility of our basing any arguments upon rights which, in spite of Royal Proclamations and official assurances, we know we do not possess, and cannot enjoy under an alien Government, the sole sanction for which lies, not in the will of the people but in naked, brute force. Sir, I will therefore confine myself to an examination of the grounds and the materials placed before this House by my Honourable friend the Home Member, and it will be my purpose to expose the hollowness of those grounds as offering no justification whatever for the promulgation of this Ordinance, or the action taken thereunder. I shall follow the example of my Honourable friend and go direct to the facts, or to be more accurate, the mixture of fact and fiction which he has placed before the House. Now, Sir, the Government case is this: There is a widespread movement, a deep-seated movement of a revolutionary character, which is supported by secret societies spread all over Bengal. Its object is to overthrow the British Government by murders, by other offences and by terrorism generally. So far as the existence of a revolutionary movement is

<sup>1</sup> *The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. V, Part I, 20th January to 12th February 1925, Delhi, 1925, pp. 820-33.*

concerned, I think it may be freely granted that it does exist. It may also be freely granted that there is some organisation which directs its operations. The question, however, Sir, is whether that movement is so deep-seated, and those organisations so widespread as to call for the exercise of extraordinary powers, and the suspension of the ordinary criminal law of the land. I submit, Sir, that on the materials placed by the Honourable the Home Member before this Chamber there is no such case made out, and I shall at once proceed to an examination of these materials. Now, Sir, the case for the Government has been put very tersely in one sentence by His Excellency the Governor of Bengal. The same things have been stated in various other pronouncements of the Government in a more or less diffused form; but I think I shall be putting the whole case in a nutshell if I remind the House of how His Excellency Lord Lytton put it. This is what His Excellency said in the Bengal Resolution of the 25th of October 1924, when the Ordinance was published in the Gazette:

"Terrorism of witnesses and juries, the failure of juries through fear to return verdicts in accordance with the evidence, the murder of witnesses and persons who have confessed or turned King's evidence, the fear of witnesses to disclose facts within their knowledge, all combine to render justice unobtainable under the existing law. These have already operated in more than one recent case."

Now, Sir, what we have got to do is to test the accuracy of that statement and see how far it is borne out by the actual facts. I shall crave the indulgence of the House to allow me to take it through the whole string of cases as briefly as I can in chronological order and establish to demonstration, with the confidence of one who has minutely and carefully studied each one of these cases, that the position taken by the Government is not at all tenable. The very first case<sup>1</sup> which happened in May 1923, is the case of dacoity with double murder, committed at a place called Kona near Howrah. That case marks the opening of the campaign of terrorism, not by the revolutionaries but by the Government, because it was an entirely false case, fabricated by the police and supported by perjured evidence. I shall tell the House what the real facts of the case were. I am reading from the Calcutta Weekly Notes, Volume 29, No. 4:

"The Kona dacoity case. It transpired in evidence that two zamindars who were murderously assaulted in the course of the alleged dacoity died in hospital. One of them in making a dying declaration mentioned the name of some of the assailants and stated that a family quarrel was the cause of the assault. Some ladies of the family also identified the assailants. The approver who alleged that the dacoity was committed in pursuance of a conspiracy stated that he had driven the taxi-cab in which the dacoits had gone to Kona and returned. To test the truthfulness of the approver the jury suggested that the approver should be asked to drive a motor car outside the court premises. A trial was held and it was found that he did not know at all how to drive a motor car."

Then comes the comment of the Editor with which I need not trouble the

<sup>1</sup>Kona Dacoity and Murder Case; armed dacoity was committed at Kona, near Howrah, Bengal, on 15 May 1923 in which two men were murdered.

hands of the Executive what is the province of the Judiciary. I say with confidence that there is no law of this kind in any civilized country, there never has been and never can be any such law in a civilized country in normal times, namely, in times like these. When I say "normal times" I distinguish such times from those when it becomes necessary to enforce martial law. In such times there may be any number of secret societies, and conspiracies. It is for the ordinary law to deal with them. There can be no other law which leaves it entirely in the hands of the Executive to decide whether a particular association is unlawful or not. But once a court of law holds that a particular association is an unlawful assembly, there are the provisions of the ordinary law to deal with that association. You do not want a special Act for it. The real sting of this Act lies in the fact that you rob the judiciary of its proper function and invest the Executive with a power which it does not and should not possess in any country. That was my point, Sir. As for the reputation of this House, well, I do not know how much of it is left in the minds of my friends opposite. I think it was the weakest reed for my Honourable friend to rely upon. The reputation of this House is that it has pledged itself to the repeal of all repressive laws. That this is a repressive law can admit of no doubt. The House will only justify its traditions and its reputation if it passes this Bill.

*293. The Bengal Criminal Law Amendment Ordinance, 5 February 1925<sup>1</sup>*

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, I rise to support the Resolution moved by my Honourable friend Mr. Duraiswami Aiyangar. In doing so I do not propose to trouble the House with well-established rules, applicable to the primary duties of the State to protect the elementary rights of the people, even under the most difficult of conditions. Enough has been said on that subject in this Chamber, in the press and from hundreds of platforms. To my mind arguments based upon those principles beg the whole question. I say so because I recognise the utter futility of our basing any arguments upon rights which, in spite of Royal Proclamations and official assurances, we know we do not possess, and cannot enjoy under an alien Government, the sole sanction for which lies, not in the will of the people but in naked, brute force. Sir, I will therefore confine myself to an examination of the grounds and the materials placed before this House by my Honourable friend the Home Member, and it will be my purpose to expose the hollowness of those grounds as offering no justification whatever for the promulgation of this Ordinance, or the action taken thereunder. I shall follow the example of my Honourable friend and go direct to the facts, or to be more accurate, the mixture of fact and fiction which he has placed before the House. Now, Sir, the Government case is this: There is a widespread movement, a deep-seated movement of a revolutionary character, which is supported by secret societies spread all over Bengal. Its object is to overthrow the British Government by murders, by other offences and by terrorism generally. So far as the existence of a revolutionary movement is

<sup>1</sup>*The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. V, Part I, 20th January to 12th February 1925, Delhi, 1925, pp. 820-33.*



concerned, I think it may be freely granted that it does exist. It may also be freely granted that there is some organisation which directs its operations. The question, however, Sir, is whether that movement is so deep-seated, and those organisations so widespread as to call for the exercise of extraordinary powers, and the suspension of the ordinary criminal law of the land. I submit, Sir, that on the materials placed by the Honourable the Home Member before this Chamber there is no such case made out, and I shall at once proceed to an examination of these materials. Now, Sir, the case for the Government has been put very tersely in one sentence by His Excellency the Governor of Bengal. The same things have been stated in various other pronouncements of the Government in a more or less diffused form; but I think I shall be putting the whole case in a nutshell if I remind the House of how His Excellency Lord Lytton put it. This is what His Excellency said in the Bengal Resolution of the 25th of October 1924, when the Ordinance was published in the Gazette:

"Terrorism of witnesses and juries, the failure of juries through fear to return verdicts in accordance with the evidence, the murder of witnesses and persons who have confessed or turned King's evidence, the fear of witnesses to disclose facts within their knowledge, all combine to render justice unobtainable under the existing law. These have already operated in more than one recent case."

Now, Sir, what we have got to do is to test the accuracy of that statement and see how far it is borne out by the actual facts. I shall crave the indulgence of the House to allow me to take it through the whole string of cases as briefly as I can in chronological order and establish to demonstration, with the confidence of one who has minutely and carefully studied each one of these cases, that the position taken by the Government is not at all tenable. The very first case<sup>1</sup> which happened in May 1923, is the case of dacoity with double murder, committed at a place called Kona near Howrah. That case marks the opening of the campaign of terrorism, not by the revolutionaries but by the Government, because it was an entirely false case, fabricated by the police and supported by perjured evidence. I shall tell the House what the real facts of the case were. I am reading from the Calcutta Weekly Notes, Volume 29, No. 4:

"The Kona dacoity case. It transpired in evidence that two zamindars who were murderously assaulted in the course of the alleged dacoity died in hospital. One of them in making a dying declaration mentioned the name of some of the assailants and stated that a family quarrel was the cause of the assault. Some ladies of the family also identified the assailants. The approver who alleged that the dacoity was committed in pursuance of a conspiracy stated that he had driven the taxi-cab in which the dacoits had gone to Kona and returned. To test the truthfulness of the approver the jury suggested that the approver should be asked to drive a motor car outside the court premises. A trial was held and it was found that he did not know at all how to drive a motor car."

Then comes the comment of the Editor with which I need not trouble the

<sup>1</sup>Kona Dacoity and Murder Case; armed dacoity was committed at Kona, near Howrah, Bengal, on 15 May 1923 in which two men were murdered.

House. Now, what is the lesson of that case? Here is a man assaulted murderously making a dying declaration in which he said the assault was due to a family quarrel and that it was a case of private revenge for a private wrong. The ladies of his house who gave a description of the assailants supported his story. All that is turned by the police for its own purposes and in order to make out a revolutionary movement in Bengal into a case of anarchical crime. My Honourable friend Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal referred to this incident rather playfully and the House was inclined also to take it in the same spirit, because it seemed to be a huge joke for a man to say he could drive a motor car and when put to the test to be found unable to do so. But it is really a very, very serious matter. It is not merely the inability of a man who pretends to be able to do something which he cannot do. It shows clearly what was the genesis of this terrorist movement in Bengal after the year 1919. It shows that your police is so unscrupulous, is so far gone down into the depths of depravity, that they would not scruple to let go the real assassins who had nothing whatever to do with any political movement and substitute others in their place. In order to bring the political movement into discredit they would go to the length of manufacturing a case from beginning to end implicating innocent persons whom they did not like and taking no proceedings against the real culprits who may have been some disappointed relations or friends of the zamindar. This, Sir, is, as I have already said, the beginning of terrorism in Bengal.

The next case that was referred to by my Honourable friend is described as the *Ultadighi Post Office case*.<sup>1</sup> It was stated that a post office in *Ultadighi* had been looted. I have not been able to trace this case as an independent case in any of the reports, but I find that it was included in the *Alipur Conspiracy case*.<sup>2</sup> The dacoits, or the robbers, whoever they were, were never traced. All we know is that a certain post office situated in a certain locality was plundered. Now, this formed one of the links in the chain of the *Alipur case* and it was put forward in that case as showing the existence of a conspiracy in Bengal. Now look into the *Alipur case*. What happened? The whole force of the prosecution was directed on the double murder in *Kona* and this *Ultadighi case*. The approver having broken down entirely, the jury and the Judge both agreed after a protracted trial lasting several months that the accused were not guilty and all the accused persons were accordingly discharged. Now, I ask, in the name of common sense, could any jury in the world have convicted a person of conspiracy when the most important evidence before them was

<sup>1</sup>*Ultadighi Post Office Case*; on 24 May 1923, *Ultadighi Post Office* in Calcutta was robbed by four armed youths.

<sup>2</sup>*Alipur Conspiracy Case*; thirty four persons including, Aurobindo Ghose, Barindra Kumar Ghose and his principal associates were arrested in connection with the case and charged with conspiracy to murder government officials. L. Birley, the District Magistrate, Alipur, started enquiry into the case after the arrests in May 1908. The trial began before C. P. Beachcroft, the Additional Sessions Judge, Alipur, on 19 October 1908. Judgement was delivered on 6 May 1909. An appeal by the accused was made in the High Court on 13 May 1909, and the final judgement was delivered in 1910. Of the accused, fifteen were ultimately found guilty and some of them including Barindra Kumar Ghose were transported for life. Aurobindo Ghose was acquitted. C. R. Das defended Aurobindo Ghose.

clearly fabricated and clearly perjured as to the chief events which constituted the conspiracy? The jury came to that conclusion and the Judge agreed with them and all the accused were acquitted; but no sooner did they step out of the court room into the verandah, what happened? Four of them were taken in custody again. And why? It was first alleged that it was under Regulation III of 1818; but these four knew something about it. They asked if the sanction of His Excellency the Governor General was there, if the order of His Excellency the Governor was there. These orders were not there and the police had to proceed under section 54 of the Criminal Procedure Code which they said they were doing and arrested these men. In course of time the order of the Governor General and the order of His Excellency the Governor of Bengal under Regulation III of 1818 were available and the men were consigned to oblivion.

...  
It is the ordinary section giving power to the police to arrest any person without a warrant for a cognizable and non-bailable offence. Then, Sir, we come to the next case. It is called the Sankaritol murder case. I doubt very much if it can be connected with the revolutionary movement, but let us assume that it was connected with that movement. There cannot be the least doubt that loot was the principal object. That case may be taken with the next case, namely, the Day murder which undoubtedly was a case of revolutionary crime. That both these murders were most deplorable there can be no doubt, but is there any justification by reason of those murders for the promulgation of an Ordinance? Do those murders and the facts attending the trial of the accused reveal the state of things which has been described by His Excellency the Governor of Bengal in the extract which I just read out? Let us see what happened, in those cases? Both in the case of the Sankaritol postmaster who was murdered and in the other it was not the police—they were of course *non est*—they always arrive after the event—it was the citizens of Bengal who captured the assailants and brought them to justice. In both these cases witnesses came forward freely and gave evidence fearlessly upon which the jury convicted fearlessly. Indeed in the case of the murderer of Mr. Day there was a plea on behalf of the accused that he was insane. There was evidence supported by medical certificates that the man was a maniac; but the jury refused to consider that plea and convicted him of murder. Both these men were sentenced to pay the extreme penalty of the law. These are the cases that are dangled before our eyes in season and out of season, cases of brutal murder no doubt, but where is there any justification, pretence, for saying that justice has miscarried in any one of them?

Then, Sir, we come to a series of cases which happened in December 1923. This series begins with the robbery of some property, belonging to the Assam-Bengal Railway, worth, it is stated, Rs. 17,000. As usual, the robbers have not been traced. The property has not been recovered; but while the police were engaged in their investigation there was a slight scuffle between them and two young men who were subsequently discovered to have pistols in their possession. These were arrested, and how? By the villagers or by the help of the villagers and not by the police. That was one case. Next, it is said by my friend, the Home Member that a sub-inspector was shot down like

a dog. That a sub-inspector was shot down was proved and proved by the evidence of Indian witnesses with the result that the accused were convicted and sentenced. Here again, I ask assuming that these cases were prompted by some revolutionary organisation where is the justification for saying that the ordinary law has failed? The real test, Sir, for the promulgation of this Ordinance and for the action taken thereunder is: has or has not the ordinary law failed? Is there a likelihood or not of the ordinary law failing in future?

Then we come to the next series. There was a bomb factory discovered sometime in March 1924. How was it discovered? Not by the action of the police. Not that they had done anything very remarkable in unearthing something which it was impossible otherwise to discover: No, they came upon a bomb factory by the sheerest accident while they were probably engaged in manufacturing evidence for some other case against some innocent person? It is admitted in the Government statements that it was by the sheerest chance that this bomb factory was discovered by the police. Well, it was discovered, men were arrested, men were tried, men were convicted and sentenced. What more do you want? (*Mr. K. Ahmed*: "What about the factory?") It was taken possession of by the Government, I suppose for future use. Lastly, three youths suspected of watching the house occupied by police officers were arrested. We do not know what they were doing there; but whatever may have been their object, these three youths were arrested, tried, convicted and sentenced. There was no witness in the case who showed any fear in giving evidence against any one of these accused; there was no juror who shook with fear when he was asked to give his verdict; they all gave it fearlessly and in the honest discharge of their duty.

Then, Sir, my friend gave the case of a "well-known member of the party arrested in Calcutta with a loaded revolver." This again was a case in which there was a conviction and sentence. I wish to ask my Honourable friend why he has mentioned these cases. Was it simply because these murders and these assaults had taken place? The mere occurrence of a case or two of murder and the mere fact of arms being found in possession of a person when those concerned are adequately dealt with by the existing law, are not enough for promulgating an Ordinance.

The last case we have is an off-shoot of the Mirzapore Street bomb case.<sup>1</sup> What happened? A bomb was thrown into a *khaddar* shop; the bomb exploded; it killed one and severely injured another; the police were not there; it was the man in the shop who jumped out, gave chase to the thrower of the bomb and eventually captured him with the assistance of other people in the street. Then the police appeared and then there was a case. The result of that case was that one of the men was convicted; the other man was acquitted and I beg the House to note particularly the fact. . . .

I beg your pardon; the man is still under trial, I think. (*An Honourable Member*: "The Government withdrew the prosecution.") I am sorry I was

<sup>1</sup>*Mirzapore Street Bomb Case*; a bomb was thrown on 22 August 1924 at a *khaddar* shop in Mirzapore street, Calcutta, killing one person and injuring others in an attack on an informer, who escaped.

thinking of the first trial. There was a reference to the High Court and then there was a retrial ordered and when the case came up for retrial the Government withdrew from the case; they did not proceed with it. (Mr. K. Ahmed here made a remark which was inaudible.) My friend, you will have your turn; do not be so impatient; if you know anything you can offer to give evidence. Now, a great deal is made of the murder of the acquitted man. My friend, the Home Member is reported in the press to have stated that this man was an approver. But my notes show that what he stated was that the man had made a statement to the police.

...  
The man who was actually tried, against whom evidence was adduced and in favour of whom there was a unanimous verdict of the jury of acquittal, could not have been an approver in the case. If he was a man who was acquitted by the jury by its unanimous verdict, I wish to know when he made the statement to the police implicating himself. Are we to believe that a man against whom the Government proceed with all their strength, give all the evidence that they can, a man who secures his acquittal by a unanimous verdict of the jury against such odds goes the very next moment to the nearest police station and says "Here I am; I am sorry the jury has acquitted me; I am really guilty; please take down my statement." Are we children? How can any man believe that a person who has been acquitted in that way will go to the police and make a statement? I should like to have that statement; I should like to know before whom that statement was made and what is more important, I should like to know through what process this man had to pass before he came to make that statement if he ever made it. But we know that he had not time enough to do so because he was acquitted on the 29th of September and on the 3rd of October his body was found in a mutilated condition somewhere between Dum Dum and some other place. Well, Sir, these are all the cases. In all these cases we find there are two or three which certainly and unmistakably point to anarchical crime. But I have admitted at the very outset that there is some such movement in Bengal. On the facts before us there is little doubt about it. I shall presently show why and how that movement came into existence. But I stop for a moment to ask again what is there to justify any one of the statements made in the extract which I read out from the Resolution of the Government of Bengal? Where is there a case where an approver has been murdered? Where is there a case in which a witness has been threatened and which has been brought to the notice of the court? Where is there a case in which the jury has failed to return a verdict of guilty in circumstances under which any other jury in the world could have returned that verdict? What has been really established is this, that wherever there has been a case in which it was possible for private citizens of Bengal to help in the detention and prevention of crime, they came forward with remarkable readiness and assisted the authorities even at the risk of losing their very lives. That is what has been established by these cases. Are you going to reward those men who have served the State, who have served the public in the manner I have shown, by putting them in the hands of the police in the way in which you have by this Ordinance? The most serious thing shown by these cases is the way,

the reckless way, in which the police manufacture evidence. Sir, I venture to say that if you look into the history of crime in other countries, you will find many more cases of this character than have occurred in Bengal. But what is the difference? In those countries crime is put down by the aid of the ordinary law, by an honest police, by a police which know how to do their duty. Here if any prosecutions have failed, they have failed simply because the police are wholly incompetent and have miserably failed in the discharge of their duties. The only thing in all the cases I have referred to that stands to the credit of the police is the accidental discovery of the bomb factory, for which they were not responsible.

The real fact is, that all these phrases, murders of approvers, murders of witnesses, intimidation of jurors, have been borrowed from the Rowlatt Committee's Report. It is not for me to go into that Report now, but what ever justification there was, even then, it is to be found in the murder of one solitary approver of the name of Gossain<sup>1</sup> who was killed as far back as the year 1908 in the jail by his co-accused. Well, as I have said, it is not for me to go into the facts of that case. I say that it is unfair, it is unjust, to go into facts of any case which happened before the year 1919 when the Royal Proclamation extending general amnesty to those involved in previous cases was made. By calling those facts to your assistance, facts which happened before the year 1919, you are stultifying yourselves, you are stultifying the Royal amnesty. If you do not take any of those cases into consideration, I challenge my Honourable friend the Home Member to show even a single instance of the use of threats, ill-treatment of approvers and witnesses and intimidation of jurors that has been stated in all the Government pronouncements. What you have got to show is not the occurrence of crime—there is crime in every country—but that the ordinary law of the land is inadequate to deal with that crime. It is this that you have to show, and if you fail to show this, you do not make out a case for any Ordinance or extraordinary powers.

Now, Sir, these imaginary murders of approvers, of witnesses and jurors are not to be found merely on the brain of the Government here. The fever has been communicated to the Government in England and what do we find? This is what the Under Secretary of State, the noble Earl Winterton, stated from his place in the House of Commons in the recent debate on the motion of Mr. Scurr. I read from a Reuter's telegram dated the 19th December last:

"Earl Winterton gave examples of cases of treatment of witnesses which he said were certainly not going to recur if the Government of India and the Imperial Government could prevent. He cited *inter alia* the Alipore conspiracy and the Calcutta bomb cases in which there was murder of witnesses."

Murder of witnesses in the Alipore case and in the Calcutta bomb case! . . .

. . .

<sup>1</sup>Narendra Lal Gossain; a revolutionary; one of the accused in Alipur Conspiracy Case; arrested on 4 May 1908; turned approver; was murdered inside the jail compound by Kanai Lal Dutt and Satyendra Nath Bose on 31 August 1908.

Yes, there was the Alipore case of 1908, the Gossain case I have already mentioned, but the Under Secretary of State had in mind the words of His Excellency the Governor of Bengal that these murders had recently happened. The exact words are "these have already operated in more than one recent case." Where is even one recent case? I shall not ask you for more than one; give me one recent case in which these things have operated, in the words of His Excellency.

As I am on this cablegram, I will read the earlier part of it also:

"Earl Winterton dealing with the Ordinance pointed out that where [there] was reasonable certainty that witnesses would come forward with a sense of security, convictions would follow and prosecutions would be held under the ordinary law, but where there was a strong presumption that witnesses would be intimidated and murdered, there should be no recourse to trial in ordinary courts."

Now, Sir, here is a test which I am prepared to accept. How am I to make out that there is a reasonable certainty that witnesses would come forward with a sense of security and give evidence except by showing that witnesses have actually come forward and to give evidence without requiring any security for their safety? I have shown that in every one of these cases witnesses have given their evidence fearlessly and that convictions have been secured where they could possibly have been expected. I therefore submit, Sir, that there is no justification for the Ordinance in the cases which have been referred to.

Let me now take some other circumstances mentioned by my Honourable friend the Home Member. He said that between July and October there were no less than five attempts to murder officials. How do we know that? He proudly said, that those attempts were frustrated by the vigilance of the police, and then piously added "and by the hand of God" and finally gave all the credit to the police. I am simply amazed at this credulity on the part of the Government. Here is a police informer giving information of very terrible things that were going to happen if he had not prevented them. They praise him for his vigilance and they thank God for protecting them by His own hand.

How are we to know? My friend says: We cannot put all the facts before you. Well, that is for the simple reason that they are unbelievable. What can they be? Can they be anything but your informers' reports? Can they be anything but the statements, one-sided statements collected by the police? Whatever the character of these statements, you know that nobody will believe them. Here I will point to an incident which will show how these things are done. My friend Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal referred to the humiliation and confinement of two very worthy citizens of Bengal, Babu Aswini Kumar Dutt<sup>1</sup> and

<sup>1</sup>Aswini Kumar Dutt; b. 1856 at Barisal; started his career as a teacher; joined the Bar at Barisal, 1880; became Commissioner of Barisal Municipality in 1885; attended the Congress sessions at Calcutta, 1886, Madras, 1887, Amraoti, 1897; became an extremist after the partition of Bengal; leader of the Swadeshi movement in Barisal, deported, 1903, released, 1910; President, Bengal Provincial Conference, Dacca, 1913; d. 1923.

Babu Krishna Kumar Mitra.<sup>1</sup> He just referred to it, and my friend Mr. Patel thought that they had been arrested owing to some mistake and that it was subsequently discovered that they were really innocent and set at liberty. Now it is very interesting to inquire how it happened and we have on this point no less an authority than that of Sir Hugh Stephenson,<sup>2</sup> who from his place in the Bengal Council said:

"I should like to mention specifically three cases which have been used in the press to throw doubts on the efficiency, if not on the *bona fides* of our methods. The first two are those of Babu Aswini Kumar Dutt and Babu Krishna Kumar Mitra. It has been said that no one will believe that they had anything to do with terrorist crime and that therefore the secret information of the police must have been false and Government may equally well be deceived by such false information now. I never knew Babu Aswini Kumar Dutt, but I am glad to think that Babu Krishna Kumar Mitra is a personal friend and I entirely acquit him of sympathy with terrorist crime. But as far as I know no one has ever accused him or Babu Aswini Kumar Dutt of promoting crime still less of taking part in it. The Bengal Government asked for the use of Regulation III in the case of Babu Aswini Kumar Dutt because—(now the cat is about to come out of the bag, as an Honourable Member said yesterday)—of his whirlwind campaign of anti-Government speeches."

Now, Sir, if I am taken at this moment under this Ordinance, there would be perfect justification for it because I have raised a whirlwind of anti-Government speeches in the past and intend to continue to do so in the future. Then he continues:

"and his control of the Braja Mohan Institution from which a stream of sedition preachers are constantly pouring. In both those cases—(now this is very important)—the activities for which these gentlemen were restrained were open and public; there was no need of secret information and there was none; there was no question of Government being deceived or of police information being false and the argument that it is sought to found on these two cases falls to the ground."

The particular argument Sir Hugh was meeting was a very weak argument, and has, I admit, fallen to the ground. But Sir Hugh probably was not aware of what I hope the House will at once see from his statement, namely, that a much stronger argument has been actually conceded by Sir Hugh Stephenson. You do not arrest men because of your possession of some secret evidence against them or of their being suspected of anything. You catch hold of honest

<sup>1</sup>Krishna Kumar Mitra; b. 1852; Assistant Secretary, Indian Association, 1876; Secretary, Brahmo Samaj, Mymensingh; taught at A.M. Bose's City School and College, Calcutta, 1879-1908; editor, *Sarvjan*; formed Nari Raksha Samiti; participated in the anti-partition agitation, arrested, 1908; remained with the Congress till 1921; d. 1937.

<sup>2</sup>Hugh L. Stephenson; b. 1871; Under Secretary, Government of Bengal, 1899-1902, Registrar, Calcutta High Court, 1902; Private Secretary to Lieutenant Governor; Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Calcutta; Financial Secretary, Government of Bengal; member, Southborough Reform Committee; member, Governor's Executive Council, Bengal, 1922-27; Acting Governor of Bengal, 1926 and 1930; Governor, Bihar and Orissa 1927-32, Governor, Burma, 1932-36; d. 1941.



men, men you know to be innocent, men you believe to be patriots, men you believe to be working in the cause of their country. You catch hold of them. And why? Because they make anti-government speeches. That for the methods. In this connection I may be permitted to remind the House of what Lord Morley said in his 'Recollections' as to these methods, because it is exactly what has happened in the present case and history has repeated itself. Writing to Lord Minto, said Lord Morley, when nine men were caught under the Regulation and Lord Morley was pleading for their release but Lord Minto would not listen:

"You have nine men locked up a year ago by *lettre de cachet*, because you believed them to be criminally connected with criminal plots, and because you expected their arrest to check these plots. For a certain time it looked as if the *coup* were effective, and were justified by the result. In all this, I think, we were perfectly right. Then you come by and by upon what you regard as a great anarchist conspiracy for sedition and murder, and you warn me that you may soon apply to me for sanction of further arbitrary arrest and detention on a large scale. I ask whether this process implies that through the nine *detenus* you have found out a murder-plot contrived, not by them, but by other people. You say, 'We admit that being locked up they can have had no share in these new abominations; but their continued detention will frighten evil-doers generally.' "

I ask the Members of this House to tell me, I ask the Home Member to tell me what difference is there between this method of frightening evil-doers by detention and the very much abused German frightfulness? Indeed, Lord Morley himself looks upon it in that light. He proceeds to say:

"That's the Russian argument; by packing off train-loads of suspects to Siberia we'll terrify the anarchists out of their wits, and all will come out right. That policy did not work out brilliantly in Russia. . . nor did it save Russia from a Duma, the very thing that. . . [the Trepoffs]. . . deprecated and detested."

Now, my friend the Home Member was asked: "when are you going to let these men off?". He said, as soon as it was consistent with "public safety." Well, Sir, I was wondering as to what public interest and public safety might mean, and it seems to me that it can have only one meaning in this country and that is bureaucratic safety and bureaucratic interest, as is clearly shown from this correspondence which passed between Lord Morley and Lord Minto. Then, Sir, I am informed—I was not in the House at the time—that my friend, the Home Member, showed much righteous indignation and pious horror at the mention of *agent provocateur*. I was told that Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal referred to something which was said by Sir Reginald Clarke.<sup>1</sup> (Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: "Written by Sir Reginald Clarke in the columns of the *Times*.") No, it was not written by Sir Reginald Clarke—I will give you his very words

<sup>1</sup>Reginald Clarke; b. 1876; joined Indian Police, 1900; Assistant Inspector-General, Bengal, 1910; Deputy Commissioner of Police, Calcutta, and Burma Military Police, 1912; Commissioner of Police, Calcutta, 1915-22; d. 1956.

—I think it occurs in a speech of his:

"I have had much experience of these agencies in the East, and often wonder whether they do not raise more devils than they lay."

And then, talking of police informers:

"One has to use them to fight anarchy, but their inevitable concomitants, the *agent provocateur* and the *lettre de cachet*,—alienate public opinion to such an extent that they can never be continued for long."

I do not know if my friend meant this or some other. (Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal "I meant this.") Then, there is another document, Sir, which I wish to refer to. This is the State Prisoners' Memorial to Whitehall. It is dated 25th July, 1924, and the names of these persons are Bhupendra Kumar Dutta<sup>1</sup> and Jiban Lal Chatterjee.<sup>2</sup> This memorial was submitted to the Government of India to be transmitted to the Secretary of State for India. These are persons who were arrested some time in September 1923. One of them was to be the editor of the *Forward* newspaper which was then proposed to be started. The other two were the manager and the editor of two vernacular papers who had declared in favour of the Swarajist policy of entering the Councils either to end or mend them. These three were taken under the Regulation. After nine months they sent this petition which was published in the *Forward* and what I am holding in my hand is a reprint from the *Forward*. These were men to whom the general amnesty of 1919 was extended. The charges that were served upon them were these:

"(1) You were arrested in the year (given the year of the last arrest) and detained as State prisoner and released under the Royal amnesty in the year (year given). (2) You were conspiring to overthrow the British Government. (3) You started and maintained *Ashrams* which were centres of revolutionary recruitment. (4) You were directly or indirectly connected with the collection of fire-arms. (5) You were connected with

<sup>1</sup>Bhupendra Kumar Dutta; b. 1894 at Thakurpur in Jessore district; studied at Faridpur Government High School, Scottish Churches College and Daulatpur Hindu Academy near Khulna, initiated into Anushilan Samui at the age of 15; imprisoned, 1917-20; arrested again, 1923, deported to Burma, released, 1928; arrested again, 1930, released, 1938; editor, *Swadhinata*, *Forward*, 1938-41 and 1946-51; detained, 1941 and released, 1946; became M.P. in Pakistan and M.L.A. in East Bengal; retired from politics in 1962 and came to Calcutta; d. 1979.

<sup>2</sup>Jiban Lal Chatterji; b. 1889; arrested in 1907 in connection with the Dacca Conspiracy Case; arrested again in 1916; joined non-cooperation movement; became a teacher in the Munshiganj National School in Dacca, associated with the Swaraj Party; imprisoned, 1923-1928; was connected with the State Prisoners' Memorial to White Hall; Secretary, Bengal P.C.C., 1930, left the Congress and set up the Democratic Vanguard in 1943 and began to help the Communist movement; Founder-President of the Workers Party of India; d. 1970.

the Indian agents of Bolshevik Manabendra Nath Roy<sup>1</sup>. (6) You were privy to the murder of police officers."

How delightfully vague. Who is there in this House who can defend himself against such vague charges if they were brought against him? If the Honourable the Home Member serves upon me these charges and calls upon me to defend myself, what can I say? However, I am not pleading for these men or for their release from wrongful arrest, but I am referring to their memorial to draw attention to certain facts they mention here which have a bearing upon the question whether there is or there is not an *agent provocateur* at work in Bengal. They say:

"We must state facts as they are. We do not deny, rather we are proud to declare that there is a widespread and deep-rooted—(What? *Not conspiracy*)—a deep-rooted demand for liberty and the thirst for liberty is very great amongst the youth of the land. They would sacrifice anything for freedom, etc."

And then they say:

"After our release, when we first joined the Indian National Congress and the non-co-operation movement we found mixing freely with the young men of the country, amongst others, a certain person whose name we are ready to disclose in case of a proper and impartial inquiry into these most serious affairs. We have knowledge that while previously locked up in jail as State prisoner this man along with some others of his ilk was in touch with and helping the secret service even from jail. While the non-violent non-co-operation movement was in its full swing he was trying to incite young men to form a party of violence. He tried to persuade even some of us to take up the leadership of such a party as against the party of non-violent non-co-operation which according to his preachings was doing immense harm to the country. Failing to instigate persons who knew something of men and things, he began to characterise those persons as having turned moderate and we know that with an amount of oratory and supported and financed by dark powers from behind he succeeded in getting together a batch of young men. We have very strong reasons to believe that whatever political violence has been committed in Bengal after the non-co-operation movement is the activity of this group consisting of the innocent dupes of this *agent provocateur* and was incited and engineered by him."

<sup>1</sup>Narendranath Bhattacharya alias M.N. Roy; b. 1887 in village Urbalia, near Calcutta; joined the National University of Aurobindo Ghose; became a member of the Jugantar Party; accused in Howrah Conspiracy Case, 1910; travelled widely in Japan, China, U.S.A., Mexico, Spain, Germany and Russia; founded the Communist Party of Mexico, 1919; presented the decolonization thesis at the Second Congress of the Communist International, 1920, accused in the Kanpur and Meerut Conspiracy Cases of 1924 and 1929; expelled from the Communist International, 1929, returned to India in 1930; attended the Karachi session of the Congress, March 1931; imprisoned in July 1931, released, 1936; attended the Congress sessions at Faizpur, 1936, Tripuri, 1939; contested election to Indian National Congress Presidency, 1940, organised the Radical Democratic Party and Indian Federation of Labour to support the war effort; established the Indian Renaissance Institute in Dehra Dun, 1946; d. 1954.

They go on to say:

"This *agent provocateur* has been systematically screened from the public eye and unobserved this creature of the secret service has been made to do whatever his masters have been wanting of him. His name once leaked out in an identification parade in connection with the Alipore conspiracy case and it came out in the court that his name had been penned through and that of an accused put instead. For obvious reasons this point was not pressed by the counsel for the defence."

Here is a fact mentioned in a memorial which has been presented to this Government to be transmitted to His Majesty's Secretary of State for India. The allegation is made there. The memorialists offer to give the name of the person. They indicate in their memorial enough to enable my friend the Home Member to spot the man. Who is this man? I ask him. What is he doing? Have these statements been tested? Have these facts been investigated? If not, what force is there in his righteous indignation at the mere mention of the name of *agent provocateur*? I may mention, Sir, that the general belief in the country is that there are such agents abroad. Of course it is impossible for men except those situated as these memorialists were to know much of their doings. But here are materials enough for the Government to proceed to inquire and to let us know the truth. If my friend the Home Member is not prepared to give us any information here and now, let him take as much time as he likes.

I have dealt with all the reasons so far as I have been able to follow my learned friend upon which he has stated that the Ordinance is a necessity. Another argument is used. My friend paid a very high eulogy to His Excellency the Governor General's talents as a lawyer and as a statesman; he relied on the fact that His Excellency had been Lord Chief Justice of England. That his pronouncements as the Lord Chief Justice of England are entitled to the highest respect no one denies. But to say that when the ex-Lord Chief Justice of England tells you that he has examined a certain case you must take it without going further into the matter is a very different thing and does not necessarily follow. I am perfectly certain that His Lordship himself, if we can imagine him taking his seat on the Bench once more and having his own findings about the Bengal Ordinance placed before him, will be the very first to throw them out as wholly inadmissible and unreliable. The most serious pronouncements made from the Bench, if they are not of a judicial nature, and pertain to what are called extra-judicial matters, have absolutely no value with anybody whatever the authority on the Bench which makes such pronouncements. You talk of His Excellency the Governor General and the ex-Lord Chief Justice of England. I say that even if angels from heaven were to go into these police informers' reports and to base their opinions and conclusions upon them, those opinions and conclusions would be wholly unreliable because of the taint in the material, and its defective nature, and not because the materials have not been well examined. I do not think that anybody has said that whatever materials were placed by the police before the Government were not thoroughly examined and scrutinised; but my point is, that that material is not reliable enough to form the basis of any investigation or the basis of any conclusion? Sir, some one in this Chamber the other day remark-

ed that a judge could not be a good administrator. I do not agree with him. I say that a judge-administrator may be a very good administrator, but when you put forward his opinions as an administrator and ask us to attach the same value to them as if they had been given by the judge, I say we cannot do so. A judge, the moment he becomes an administrator, is like a boat cut off from its moorings. He has to form his judgement not upon the material which he has been using as a judge for his judicial inferences and conclusions. That material must be legally admissible evidence. The tests which have been provided by the law must be applied to it and it must stand those tests. But an administrator does nothing of the kind. You may rely upon his Lordship's experience. I have no reason to object to that—nor am I prepared to say anything about the correctness or incorrectness of the conclusions come to on the materials available. What I say is that the material itself upon which conclusions have been based was wholly unreliable.

The next point that was discussed was the fact that this House was not consulted before the Ordinance was promulgated. This House was not sitting at the time and I am not willing to attribute any motives to the Government on the score of the Ordinance being promulgated soon after the September session was over. But what I say is this, that His Excellency the Governor General having passed and promulgated this Ordinance it is wrong to say that he and he alone is responsible for keeping it in force. I do not accede to that proposition. While I admit the right and the initial responsibility of His Excellency the Governor General in issuing and promulgating this Ordinance, I deny that His Excellency is responsible for keeping it in force. On the contrary, I maintain that it is this House and this House alone which has the right and the responsibility in itself, undivided and unshared by anybody else. The moment this House came into session it was its right—it was not only its right, but under section 72 it was its duty to see whether this Ordinance was to continue a day longer or not. It was with this object that I submitted my Bill which proposed to supersede and repeal the Ordinance, but I was informed a few days ago that His Excellency under the circumstances was unable to give me his sanction to introduce the Bill. I may here refer to section 72 for a minute. It runs:

"The Governor General may, in cases of emergency, make and promulgate Ordinances for the peace and good government of British India or any part thereof, and any Ordinance so made shall, for the space of not more than six months from its promulgation, have the like force of law as an Act passed by the Indian Legislature, but the power of making Ordinances under this section is subject to the like restrictions as the power of the Indian Legislature to make laws; and any Ordinance made under this section is subject to the like disallowance as an Act passed by the Indian Legislature and may be controlled or superseded by any such Act".

that is to say, by such Act of the Legislature. I contend that this Legislature has a constitutional right not subject to disallowance by His Excellency the Governor General of superseding, confirming or repealing this Ordinance and it is this right of the House which I sought to exercise by the introduction of my Bill which I have not been allowed to do. It is, therefore, incorrect to say that the responsibility is solely that of His Excellency. My submission to the

House is that, in the first place, there was absolutely no justification for His Excellency to exercise the right which he undoubtedly possesses under section 72 to promulgate the Ordinance. In the second place, I say that His Excellency and the Government have no say in the matter now. It is this House and this House alone which can determine whether that Ordinance shall go on or shall at once be withdrawn. I know that there is a provision in the Act that the introduction of a Bill like mine is subject to the sanction of His Excellency. I can conceive occasions when it would be necessary for His Excellency to withhold sanction. That section must be read with section 72, and when section 72 gives this Legislature an inherent right and another section says that it is subject to sanction there must be some meaning in that. We must reconcile the two sections and the only way in which they can be reconciled is that unless there is something very, very exceptional—suppose for instance there was a general rebellion to-day and the Viceroy in those circumstances exercised his discretion and said, "No. This Bill shall not be introduced in the House." I could understand it. But what are the special circumstances in this case? There must be something very special under which the Governor General could exercise the discretion vested in him about sanctioning or withholding sanction to a Bill of this character. We are living in peaceful times, there is no rebellion afoot, we have our usual life going on, we have our big dinners and entertainments and we are going to have a Baby Show next week.

Lastly, my Honourable friend, the Home Member, told us "We are not devoid of political foresight." Well, Sir, I am very sorry to say that that commodity has never been known to be available in the bureaucratic shop. Take the recent events. Take the two big turns that the political situation has taken in quite recent times in this country and see with what political foresight. . . .

I am very sorry to have exceeded my time limit. There is one more point I wish to make with your permission and it is this. Whatever has been done under the Ordinance itself in the way of arresting these people and keeping them in custody could have been done under the ordinary law. There is nothing including the great round-up of the 25th of October last which could not be done under the ordinary law. I wish to know from the Honourable the Home Member if there is anything that has been done which could not be done under the ordinary law. The fact is that one kind of terrorism has been set up against another kind of terrorism. We were told by His Excellency and rightly told that no political party can continue to live with terror for a friend. Now, Sir, there is no doubt that, terrorist organisations exist in this country, but the greatest and the most powerful of these organisations is the Government of India and their terrorist agencies in the provinces. It was very rightly observed by His Excellency that the parasite kills the host. I say, Sir, that that observation applies to terrorism both of political parties and of the Government and the parasite will kill the host in either case. Neither can continue to have terror for a friend. I regret I have exceeded my time, and I thank you, Sir, for allowing me great latitude. I appeal to all Members of the House.

I mean all non-official Members, to vote unanimously in favour of this Resolution.

294. *The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill, 10 February 1925*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, I had no intention whatever of taking part in this debate, but the speech which has just been made has come to me like a bolt from the blue and I feel that I must intervene. I could not conceive that any Indian could have given expression to the feelings and sentiments which my great friend Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas has done. I think, Sir, that when he describes this as a pin-prick, he is probably thinking of the millions which are perhaps to be made in South Africa or something of the kind. I could understand my European friends here standing up one after another and speaking of this measure as a retaliatory measure, but when an Indian calls it a retaliatory measure, I say, Sir, that it takes my breath away. What is the retaliation here? What are we doing to them which we do not want for ourselves. These Colonials come to our country. It is said they have the privilege of having a superior status to ourselves. I deny that proposition and I emphatically repudiate all the implications of that proposition. I say they are no better and no worse than we are. It is said that there was a compromise. I say—and I thank heaven—that neither I nor any of my friends on whose judgement I can rely was a party to that compromise. Those who entered into that compromise, did so in their own personal capacity. They have no right to say, having regard to the feeling in the country, that they in any sense represented their electorates or the general public of India. They are quite welcome to abide by their compromise if they are so minded. I for one would not treat it even as a scrap of paper. I would not touch it with a pair of tongs. It is a thing which puts me to the indignity in my own country of occupying a far lower position, lower status, than a Colonial. Sir, when my friend Mr. Patel referred to his having disappointed some of his friends by limiting that measure to Colonials, he was referring to me. It was I who was disappointed. What difference is there between a true born Britisher and a Colonial? Anybody who comes to this country is quite welcome to have the same rights, the same privileges which we have. But what right has anyone to say that "we are in your country because we are of a certain colour or belong to a certain race, therefore we occupy a position in which even our criminals must be treated better than your criminals". Where is the justice of it and where is the question of retaliation? Do we want any position for ourselves in South Africa or any of the Colonies which the Colonials themselves do not enjoy? Are we not giving them all that we enjoy ourselves? What right has anybody to say that he is entitled to more than the people of the country itself? Yes, I know there is one right and that right is might, and it is due to that right of might that we have suffered so long from the disgrace of these enactments. My friend Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas asked: "What has happened recently that we should pass this legislation at once?" I say that every minute that we allow to

<sup>1</sup> *The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. V, Part I, 20th January to 12th February, 1925, Delhi, 1925, pp. 960-61.*

pass by now that the matter has come up before this House is a disgrace to every Indian member of this House. That is my opinion. (*Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar*: "That is not the measure now before the House.") I quite agree with my Honourable friend Mr. Rangachariar if he wants the matter to be considered in the Select Committee although I fail to understand what there is to be considered about it. I welcome this because I may have a chance of moving an amendment to strike out the words "other than a British-born subject" so that this enactment may be of general application to all and sundry whether they be European British-born subjects or Colonials or Americans. Sir, the feeling of a true Indian is and ought to be to put himself the question: "Why is it that this piece of legislation has been allowed to remain a blot upon the Statute-book so long?" and resolve that it should not for a minute longer continue to remain on the Statute-book. It is with that feeling, I hope, that the whole of this House or at least the great majority of it is inspired. I strongly oppose any motion for adjournment *sine die*. But, if Mr. Rangachariar seriously wants a Select Committee, I have no objection to give Members of the House a chance of meeting across the table and explaining their views. I, therefore, Sir, oppose the motion for adjournment *sine die*.

**295. The Legislative Assembly (President's Salary) Bill, 11 February 1925<sup>1</sup>**

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, I am sorry I was not in the House to hear the whole of the speech of my friend Sir Campbell Rhodes,<sup>2</sup> but the latter part of it which I heard has my full concurrence. There is no doubt that the President that we select should be a man of outstanding ability, of high character and of noble deportment. I do not think that age is so much a qualification as my friend Sir Henry Stanyon<sup>3</sup> suggested. But there is one thing in which I differ from the great majority of the Honourable Members who have already spoken, and that is that they seem to have taken salary to be fixed as compensation for the President for devoting his abilities and his time to the work of the Assembly. My impression is that all the Members of this House—I do not mean the salaried Government Members, but the non-official Members of the House—are here to do public service. They are not here to expect any remuneration for that service and the President of this House certainly will not expect anything like the remuneration for his services and for his time which he is accustomed to receive in his own business or profession (*A Voice*: "Why not?") for the simple reason that I know of persons eminently qualified to

<sup>1</sup>The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. V, Part I, 20th January to 12th February, 1925, Delhi, 1925, pp. 974-75.

<sup>2</sup>Campbell Ward Rhodes; b. 1874; member, Indian Fiscal Commission, 1921-22 and Bengal Retrenchment Committee; President, Bengal Chamber of Commerce, Associated Chambers of India and Ceylon, 1922, member, Secretary of State's Council, 1925-35; Governor, La Martiniere School, Calcutta; d. 1941.

<sup>3</sup>Henry John Stanyon; b. 1857 at Meerut, U.P.; educated at Bishop Cotton School, Simla; practised at Agra, 1881-82, Jabalpur, 1882-97; President, Jabalpur Municipal Board, 1892-97; Additional Judicial Commissioner, C.P. and Berar, 1904; ADC to the Viceroy of India; member, U.P. Legislative Council, 1920-21, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1922-26; d. 1934.



occupy the Chair to whom no salary you could offer would be adequate compensation, and yet they may be public-spirited enough to occupy the Chair and guide the business in this House. I differ from the proposition that it should be a tempting salary. The temptation for the President should lie in the service he is called upon to render and not in the salary which he is likely to get. But I recognise that the President, like all other human beings, has got to live. He has got to maintain a position. If you like to call it dignity you may. But to my mind the dignity of the President consists in the manner in which he discharges the duties of his office. I am happy, Sir, to join with my friends who have gone before me in saying that, if the dignity of the House is preserved by your successor in the manner in which it has been preserved by you, it is all that we would desire. Having all these considerations before my mind, I feel, Sir, that it is very difficult for any one to draw a sharp line and say this figure and no more, or this figure and no less. It is really very difficult. I may mention that we have considered the question in our party meetings, and as the nature of the question shows, there could not be any agreement upon a matter like this. But I think that, if the salary is put at anything between Rs. 2,000 and Rs. 3,000, it ought to be quite enough for all the purposes which we have in contemplation. I eliminate altogether, Sir, as I have already submitted, the compensation for the abilities which the President has to bring to bear on the discharge of his duties. Now, Sir, as regards his being a whole-time man, I quite agree with the previous speakers. As regards his maintaining a wholly impartial attitude, again I am at one with my friend Sir Campbell Rhodes and the other speakers, but I have to add that the selection of a party man as President must necessarily be taken to be an invitation to him, and if he accepts the office, to be an undertaking from him, to cease to be a party man from the moment he takes office. That is a *desideratum* which we shall certainly bear in mind when we go to elect our President. Comparisons are always odious, comparisons between the salaries of the Executive Councillors, Secretaries or other Government officials are specially so. I would beg the Members entirely to free their minds from all such comparisons. All that they have to consider is what is a reasonable salary for a President with the qualifications I have mentioned, not to enable him to make a dash as Sir Henry Stanyon has just said, but to live like a gentleman and to maintain the position which is his by reason of his occupying the Chair of this House. I may mention here, though I do not know how far it is correct, that I read in one of the newspapers some time ago that Mustapha Kemal Pasha drew a salary of only £ 40 a month. Now that is a government of the people by themselves, and if a person of the distinction of Mustapha Kemal Pasha and his position in the country as the head of the administration, can keep all the dignity attached to that position on £ 40 a month, I do expect that the President of this House ought to be able to do so with something between Rs. 2,000 and Rs. 3,000. As for the respect which this House will pay to its President, I submit it is for the House itself to determine who is the person who will command their respect. It is essential that the President that we select should command the confidence not only of this House, but of the public.

296. *Establishment of a Supreme Court in India, 17 February 1925<sup>1</sup>*

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, I rise to speak on this motion not because I consider it absolutely necessary to do so but because I think I owe it to my friend Sir Hari Singh Gour who had kindly furnished me with an advance copy of the speech he has delivered to-day to say something about it. I am sorry to say that I cannot support him, but I consider it my duty to give my reasons for differing from him. My Honourable friend had probably been dreaming of a federal India when he framed this Resolution. I am afraid that dream will take some time to be realised and meanwhile, I think his proposal of having a Supreme Court in India is a bit premature. My friend has tried to water the top of the tree instead of its roots. The judicial system and the constitution of courts in this country in my humble opinion require overhauling from top to bottom. A country where the executive and the judicial functions are combined, where a controversy has been raging for years past over the separation of these two functions without any results, a country where there are racial discriminations in the administration of criminal justice, is not the country to have a Supreme Court within its own borders. I think it is too high an ambition to be entertained. The very first thing that we have got to do is to reform such courts as we have and also the procedure which is followed in these courts. No number of Supreme Courts in India would in any way promote the cause of justice so long as the executive and the judicial functions remain combined as they are and racial discriminations continue to be observed as now. The arguments which have been advanced by my friend have been sufficiently answered by my friend the Honourable Sir Henry Stanyon and other speakers. I wish only to point out that a distance of six or seven thousand miles between the highest court of appeal and the Government of India is in my opinion none too long. After all, Sir, an appeal to the Privy Council, as I know from my personal experience, is more or less a luxury for the rich, and I really do not see why the poor man should be burdened in order to afford that luxury to the rich. If a Supreme Court is established in India, the finances of India will have to be burdened with the expense of the maintenance of that Court. That means taxation, and there is no reason whatever why this luxury should be enjoyed by the rich at the expense of the poor. Now, Sir, I must not be taken in any way to minimise the importance of the Privy Council. As it is, cases of the grossest injustice have happened in this country and they have been taken to the Privy Council at a more or less reasonable cost to the litigants. In fact, I have myself been concerned with small and petty cases in which the importance of the question raised induced their Lordships of the Privy Council to give special leave to appeal. Some of these appeals have been successful in very small cases in which the successful litigant before their Lordships had lost all along the line from the Munsif's court to the High Court. Reports will be found in the books laying down most important principles of law in petty cases which have since governed big as well as small cases. It is not always that the cost of a Privy Council appeal

<sup>1</sup> *The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. V, Part II, 10th February to 6th March, 1925, Delhi, 1925, pp. 1171-72.*

is prohibitive. In most cases it is, but not always. In any case, I think whatever hardship is at present suffered on that score is not too high a price to pay for the justice that is ordinarily obtained in the Privy Council.

As for the personnel of the proposed Court, I generally agree in what my friend Sir Henry Stanyon has said. In my own opinion, Sir, it will be difficult to find competent men to occupy seats on the Bench of the Supreme Court of India outside the ranks of superannuated judges or chief justices or perhaps also equally superannuated members of the Bar. I really do not see how else it will be possible to fill the appointments that will be thrown open on the Bench of this exalted Court. There is every reason at the present stage for us not to think of a Supreme Court in India. I quite agree that the time for it will be when we are a self-governing people and not a day before.

297. *The Legislative Assembly (President's Salary) Bill, 18 February 1925<sup>1</sup>*

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, I am very thankful to my friend Mr. Jinnah for the lecture he has just given on the elementary principles of law, but if he had only considered all the words of the proposed amendment of the Honourable Mr. Graham<sup>2</sup> and not confined his attention merely to the words "any employment for remuneration" he would have seen that there are words there which do cover a shareholder who, even less than an elementary knowledge of law would tell him, does take part in the trade in which he takes a share. I understand the intention of the Mover of the amendment to be that the words "other than as a shareholder", should come immediately after the word "trade"—i.e., "engaged in any trade other than as a shareholder"; and I do not know of any principle of law, elementary or otherwise, by which it can be said that a shareholder who holds a share in a commercial concern does not engage in trade.

Then as to the remarks of my Honourable friend about our President not accepting the office of director in any company, whether it be one or half a dozen companies, I agree, but it should be made clear. In my opinion a shareholder who has shares in a joint stock company, or for the matter of that even in a private concern, does engage in the trade of that company or concern to the extent of his share.

I would put my Honourable friend's amendment in the form of an exception to make it quite clear. Instead of putting the words "otherwise than as a shareholder" in the clause itself I would suggest that after the amendment of my Honourable friend Mr. Graham an exception be inserted that a shareholder in a joint stock company (I would confine it to a joint stock

<sup>1</sup>*The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. V, Part II, 16th February to 6th March, 1925, Delhi, 1925, p. 1202.*

<sup>2</sup>Lancelot Graham; b. 1880; served in Bombay as Assistant Collector and Magistrate; Assistant Collector, 1904, Assistant Judge, 1909; Assistant Legal Remembrancer, 1911; Judicial Assistant in Kathiawar, 1913; Additional Joint Secretary, Legislative Department, Government of India, 1921; Governor, Sind, 1936-41; d. 1938.

company) shall not be deemed to engage in a trade for the purposes of this section.

Is it a matter of fact or a matter of law—that a shareholder is not concerned in the trade in which he has a share?

Then it is as mixed up as my friend.

*298. Establishment of a Military College, 19 February 1925<sup>1</sup>*

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, the Resolution before the House is one on which there can be no two opinions so far as the Indian public is concerned. The whole of India—and I am speaking of Indian India—is solidly in favour of the proposition. The fact is there and no amount of reasoning can shut our eyes to it. I have heard today a very strong case attempted to be made out by my friend the Honourable Mr. Burdon. I have heard also the very warm appeal made by my friend Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya. I have listened to the cold reasoning of my friend Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer and I have also heard the very powerful indictment of the Government of India by my friend Mr. Jinnah. If, Sir, everyone of us, the Indian element in this House, were to be given a chance to say a few words, I have not the least doubt in my mind that they will all echo the same feeling. Now, as for the speech of Colonel Crawford<sup>2</sup>, I was wondering what was the case that my gallant friend was trying to make out. He was probably fighting a shadow. He has no doubt fought many substantial enemies in the past, but today I am bound to say that it was nothing but a shadow that he was fighting. He was forgetting that we are not asking that the Indian Army should be officered by Indians all at once. He was complaining that what Indians want is training and training of a special character which befits the British officer to lead an army. What is it that we are asking for? We are asking just for a training ground, just for an opportunity to bring up our young men in the same manner as English officers are brought up. And how are we to get it? Sir, only the other day as to one proposition which was before the House, namely, the establishment of a Supreme Court, I committed myself to the opinion that the time for that will be when we have responsible government. But there are questions and questions. This is a matter in which we cannot wait for a single moment. We are unfit to defend our country and therefore there is no responsible government. Why are we unfit to defend our country? Because there is no responsible government. It is a vicious circle. Unless the two things go on together and unless we begin to qualify ourselves to defend our country at the earliest possible opportunity, the argument will hold good for ages to come. Not that it is disputed by anybody that the time has not come for us to prepare to defend our country. It is only the method, it is only the procedure, it is only the manner in which all the difference lies. Now, whatever may be said by the

<sup>1</sup>The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. V, Part II, 16th February to 6th March 1925, Delhi, 1925, pp. 1250-53.

<sup>2</sup>Colonel J.D. Crawford, represented Bengal Europeans in the Indian Legislative Assembly, 1925-30.

Government or their apologists, the fact cannot be burked that it is the Government and the Government alone which is to blame for the present state of things. Why are we not ready? Because you came in our way. You did not permit us to be ready. You disarmed us and then you did not afford sufficient opportunity for the young men of the country to train themselves for the army. Now that it is past high time it is said that there are difficulties in the way. But who has created those difficulties? I have not the least hesitation in saying that they are all of your own making. If you had only begun in time, today it would have been possible, after 150 years, to man all the officers of the Indian army by Indians. (*A Voice*: "Then where would the British Empire go!") That is just the difficulty. But surely there are friends like my Honourable friend Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, who say that we will be proud to continue the present connection with England for all time to come. I am not of that opinion. Not that I am against keeping up the connection between England and India, but that it should be on very different terms to what obtains at present. There has been a suggestion made by my friend Mr. Jinnah and a formal amendment moved by my friend Mr. Rangachariar.

...

That is what I was going to explain. My friend Mr. Jinnah need not anticipate me. I was just going to say the very thing he stood up to explain. There is a vast difference between the suggestion of Mr. Jinnah and the formal amendment which has been proposed by my friend Mr. Rangachariar and I may at once say that I thoroughly agree with Mr. Jinnah. Resolutions, Sir, are moved in this House. They are either carried or defeated. Even if carried, they occupy no higher place than those which have been defeated because the Government do not usually act upon them. But in this case a formal Resolution has actually been accepted by the Government and yet we find that no definite steps have been taken up to this day. On the contrary, what has happened is that the acceptance of that Resolution has been conveniently forgotten as has been shown by Mr. Jinnah. But what I would submit to the House is this, that the mere carrying of this Resolution will not help to carry far. As far as I have been able to understand my friend Mr. Burdon, I feel that he at least has an honest and sincere desire to see that definite steps are taken in order to make it a practical proposition and not merely a Resolution which would be passed by this House and then forgotten. I think, if I have been able to understand my friend Mr. Jinnah correctly, his view was not merely that this Resolution should be adopted by this House and accepted by the Government of India, but that the Government should at once proceed to act upon it by taking steps to formulate a scheme with the assistance of some Members of this House, and of expert advice, and I would add, by a visit to the various training colleges, Sandhurst and others if necessary. If the Government will accede to that suggestion and thus put a practical shape to the proposition, I think it would be far better than merely carrying this proposition by a majority of our votes. I do hope, Sir, that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief will see his way to accept the principle of the Resolution, and to go further and appoint, or at least allow this House to appoint, a committee which, in collaboration with experts, would draw up a scheme of what is

possible in the present circumstances in order to make a beginning. For the rest, I submit, Sir, that the argument on the Government side comes to this: because you get far better training in Sandhurst, therefore it is not advisable to have it here on the ground of expense and other things. If that argument were to hold good and be carried to its logical end the result would be that we would have to shut up all our colleges and universities because undoubtedly the training now given in the English colleges and universities is far superior to what we get here. But it would be absurd to suggest such a thing. We want to make a beginning in our country under the circumstances in which we live. My friend Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer said that we can have everything here except the atmosphere. I say we can also have the proper atmosphere for a military career. The example of Japan was given. What has Japan done? My friend Sir Hari Singh Gour put a very pertinent question to Colonel Crawford when he was talking of the indispensability of an English training. He asked "What about Japan?" but the gallant Colonel did not give a reply. Of course they did not all receive their training at Sandhurst, nor did they qualify themselves anywhere else in England. There are many nations in the world whose armies are officered by their own nationals and not by Englishmen, or men who have been trained in Sandhurst. The only difference is that in other countries they have their own Government; they evolve their own schemes; they import persons with expert knowledge and do all that is needed. We are helpless and therefore we cannot get on unless this Resolution meets with the acceptance of the Government of India and His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief takes the interest for which my friend Mr. Rangachariar has appealed to him. I therefore would suggest, Sir, that the Government will be pleased and His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief will be good enough to see eye to eye with this House, and the whole country, and give due weight to public opinion on this very essential and vital question. That can only be done by facilitating the training of Indians for a military career in their own country. It may be that under exceptional circumstances and for certain high posts a special training in England may be considered necessary. To that I do not think there can be any objection, but a beginning must be made in the country itself. We must have our young men to look up to an institution where they can look forward to a brilliant military career.

I need not take up the time of the House as to the argument of my Honourable friend Colonel Crawford about martial races not being educated enough and non-martial races being better educated. Sir, the distinction between martial and non-martial races is fast disappearing and as soon as there is an opening in this country for a military career you will find that even the non-martial races will flock to the college in such numbers that you will be surprised. They will be found in every way to be fit for a military career. (Colonel J. D. Crawford: "But will they stay?") What reason have you for saying they will not stay. Who are after all the martial races? It is surely not the caste system by which we are to be guided. It is not that a Brahmin is only a priest. You have got your Ist Brahmans. You have got the Baswara Brahmans. (Mr. K C. Neogy: "Even the Bengali Regiment".) Yes, even the Bengali regiment. All the talk about martial and non-martial races is ancient history that will not hold water now.

...  
He did not say that. What I understood Colonel Crawford to mean was that general education was lacking in the martial classes and officers must have a groundwork of general education before they can be given expert and technical education in military affairs. But I say that is not the case. I say that among those who have a grounding of general education you will find martial people and martial races; and that there does not exist any sharp line of cleavage between non-martial and martial races in India.

We may spend the whole of to-day and to-morrow also if we like on this Resolution. There will be any amount of good argument forthcoming from the side of the Indian section of this House and there will be any amount of excuses on the other side. The question has been discussed threadbare in the country. As I have said, you cannot convince us that there are such difficulties in your way that you cannot overcome them. We claim that we have succeeded in convincing you that those difficulties are nothing compared to the advantages which are bound to accrue not only to India but to England as well. For these reasons, Sir, I support this Resolution and I again appeal to His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief to accept it in principle, and not only to accept it in principle but accompany his acceptance by something definite and something substantial in the way of actually framing a scheme which would lead to the establishment of a military college in India in the near future.

*299. The Railway Budget—List of Demands, 25 February 1925<sup>1</sup>*

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, I rise to move:

"That the Demand under the Head 1, Railway Board, be omitted."

The motion, as Honourable Members will have observed, is intended to draw attention to the general railway policy pursued in this country, and to condemn it in the strongest possible manner that is open to this House. I fully realise, Sir, the grave responsibility which rests upon me in adopting this course, but I do so with the confidence born of a deep-rooted conviction that it is the right course to follow. The motion is based upon grievances as old as the railway system itself in this country, and the persistent disregard by the authorities of the best interests of the people. I know, Sir, I am inviting a storm of opposition, not only from the Treasury Benches, but also from more friendly quarters. We are little perturbed by the rise and fall of the official barometer, but when the centre of disturbance is shifted to other parts of the House it does become a matter for serious consideration. Let me assure the House that we have given the matter our most anxious and most serious consideration and that nothing but a compelling sense of duty to the country could have induced us to take this extreme constitutional course. Sir, the grievances that I have spoken of have been accumulating for the past three-quarters of a century and they have now reached the stage at which nothing short of a complete refusal of supplies would meet the situation. We are not

<sup>1</sup> *The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. V, Part II, 16th February to 6th March, 1925, Delhi, 1925, pp. 1483-93, 1544.*

adopting the usual course of moving small cuts of Rs. 100 or so which is done with the intention of drawing attention to some matter of policy or to convey a mild censure for something which has been wrongly done or omitted to be done. We think that the matter is far too serious to be dealt with in that way and that the only proper way of dealing with it is to apply most strictly the principle, "grievances before supplies".

Now, Sir, it has been stated that railway matters are commercial matters and that railway policy should be discussed like any other commercial policy detached from political and constitutional considerations. I beg to dissent entirely from that view. I submit that Railways are the biggest political machine in this country and that railway policy has a very far-reaching effect upon not only the commercial and economic but also the political conditions prevailing in the country. The Railway Board has the statutory sanction of being a sort of *imperium in imperio* and has been aptly described as bearing the same relation to the Government of India as Provincial Governments do. The only difference is that while the Provincial Governments are outside that holy of holies the Government of India, the Railway Board is within it. They have within the *sanctum sanctorum* a member of the family, or shall I call my Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes the *pater familias* of the Railway Board? Except perhaps for that difference the Railway Board is as self-contained as any Provincial Government and is master in its own house. That being so, the question is when the Railway Budget is put before this House and when there is a constitutional issue to be raised, how and when it is to be raised? Now, Sir, the very fact that railway finance has been separated from the general finance and the manner in which the demands made by the Department have been formulated and put before this House is to my mind a clear invitation to the House to treat the Railway Budget and the Department as it would treat the General Budget and the Government of India. There can be no doubt that it is the inherent right of this House to refuse supplies on a proper case being established, and when the matter relates to the Railway Administration I submit that the only proper occasion to raise the question is on the first motion before us which asks for a grant to the Central Administrative authority for all Railways in India. The only question therefore is whether in this instance a proper case has been made out. Now, Sir, I shall in one word show that it is fully established. It is well-known that the Railway Board is a wholly irresponsible body in the sense that it is not responsible to the Legislature. (*Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar*: "Why not?") I will explain. Because the members are not removable at the will of the Legislature, their salaries are not votable, and we cannot deal with them as we would deal with any authority which is responsible to us. My Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes in the course of his speech likened the presentation of the Railway Budget to a report made by the directors to the shareholders of a company. That I submit is a false analogy. The true relation is that of principal and agent. The Railway Board is the agent of the people of India whose money it deals with, whose money it takes and spends. But in this case it is not the principal, but the agent who is the real master. The principal is wholly powerless. The agent has not even given him the right to vote his salary. All that he comes before the master for is the charges for his maintenance and establi-



shment. Now, Sir, what is, in these circumstances, the obvious right and the plain duty of the master? It is to obtain full control over the salaries of his own servants and make them responsible to himself. What is done here is that the master is asked simply to sanction the charges and expenditure necessary for the establishment of the agent to enable him to carry on his work. The master says, "No, I shall have nothing to do with it unless you, the agent, become responsible to me for everything that you do; and so long as that responsibility is not established you shall have nothing from me." Now, Sir, I ask, is there any way other than the one I have adopted of standing upon that right for the master, whose representatives we are in this House? (*Mr. K. Ahmed*: "By reducing the amount.") My Honourable friend, Mr. Kabeerud-Din Ahmed says 'by reducing the amount', and he shakes his head with the confidence that is born of ignorance. Reduction of a grant means that you approve of the remainder of the grant; reduction of the grant means that you are taking exception to some matter of policy to which you draw attention and that you do not mean to dismiss the servant. I stand here on behalf of those who have elected me to demand the instant dismissal of the servant who is not responsible to me. (*Mr. K. Ahmed*: "Can you manage without them?") I may or may not be able to manage, but that is my right and I am here to assert it. Sir, I cannot understand how any cut, however large, can take the place of the motion that I am putting before this House. What I say is give us a Railway Board with responsibility to the Legislature or no Railway Board at all. How that question can be raised in any but the form in which I have raised it, I fail to understand. As I have said we have given our most anxious consideration to this question and I confess my inability to think of any other way more proper, more correct, than the one which I have adopted.

Now, Sir, as I have said, the one ground, the one constitutional ground upon which I rest my case is that the Railway Board not being responsible to us we have the right to withhold supplies until that responsibility is established. But I may be allowed a few minutes to show very briefly without going into details what have so far been the results of this irresponsibility of the Railway Administration. The real question is one of principle; however competent, however good the management may be, if the manager is not responsible to me, I say that I will not look into what he has done or what he can do unless and until he admits his responsibility to me. But there are things which have not been done well and not only not done well but so grossly mismanaged that they afford strong reasons why this state of irresponsibility should be allowed to continue. Sir, the first and foremost thing which strikes one is that there has not been found one Indian capable of being admitted in this august body, the Railway Board, throughout the length and breadth of the country. It is said that no Indian with the necessary qualification is forthcoming. Is it not a sad commentary on your Railway Administration that during three-quarters of a century you have not been able to train one single Indian who can occupy the place of a member of the Railway Board? But I deny the fact. I do not admit that there is no Indian who is capable of doing as well as any other member of this Board. You say special knowledge is necessary. There is my old friend and enemy, the Honourable

Mr. Sim<sup>1</sup>. We have worked together in the old Minto-Morley Councils and I have had the pleasure several times of measuring swords with him in those Councils. He is today the Blackett of the Railway Board. Now, I want to know what special railway training has he ever received? Is there no Indian who could have taken his place? Leave alone the traffic engineering and other technical departments though there undoubtedly are Indians who are fully competent to take charge of them. To name only one, Sir M. Visveswarayya<sup>2</sup>, a gentleman whose high authority was admitted by the Acworth Committee<sup>3</sup>. It would be invidious to name others, but I am perfectly certain that there is no lack of men.

Then, Sir, what is the next? Your highest officers are quite out of touch with Indians and how have you safeguarded the interests of Indians? The whole railway policy from its very inception has been a policy of exploitation. It began with a system of guaranteed railways. The time at my disposal will not permit my going into that, but I would refer the House to the very valuable chapter in Mr. Dutt's<sup>4</sup> "Economic History of India," the chapter on Irrigation and Railways. They will find a full account of the exploitation of the country, of the motives which guided early railway policy and of the actual service or disservice done to the people. The real service certainly was not rendered to the master but to the exporter from England. (Mr. V. J. Patel: "They are the masters.") They are the real masters, there is no doubt. Sir, millions of rupees, millions of lakhs of rupees, I may say, have been paid simply as interest during the past years to those guaranteed railway companies. No doubt there was also some service done to the public in carrying

<sup>1</sup>George Gail Sim, b. 1878; served in U.P. as Assistant Magistrate and Collector; Under Secretary to Government, 1908-10; Chairman, Kanpur Municipal Board, 1912-17; Financial Secretary, U.P. Government, 1917-20, Joint Secretary, Finance Department, Government of India, 1921; Financial Commissioner of Railways, Government of India, 1923-26; d. 1930.

<sup>2</sup>M. Visveswaraya, b. 1861; engineer, administrator and statesman; appointed Assistant Engineer, Bombay Public Works Department, 1884, worked for the improvement of water supply and drainage system in Sukkur, Sind, 1894-95; Executive Engineer, Poona Irrigation District, 1899, Sanitary Engineer, Poona Municipality, 1901; Fellow, Bombay University, 1904, paid a visit to U.K., U.S.A., Canada, Sweden and Russia, 1908-09; Special Consulting Engineer, Hyderabad; Chief Engineer, Mysore State, 1909; Dewan of Mysore, 1912-19; member, New Capital Enquiry Committee, Delhi, 1922, Backbay Reclamation Enquiry Committee, Bombay, 1926; helped in the establishment of Premier Automobile Company, Bombay and Hindustan Aircraft Factory, Bangalore; Director, Tata Iron and Steel Company, 1927-55, author of *Planned Economy for India*, 1934; awarded the Bharat Ratna in 1955, d. 1962.

<sup>3</sup>Acworth Committee; Indian Railways Committee (1920-21), under the Chairmanship of William Mitchell Acworth, was appointed by the Secretary of State for India to inquire into the administration and working of the Indian Railways.

<sup>4</sup>R.C. Dutt, b. 1848 in Calcutta, studied in Harris School and Presidency College, Calcutta; entered I.C.S., 1871; Assistant Magistrate, Alipore, District Officer, Alipore, 1882-94; Divisional Commissioner, Burdwan Division, 1894, 1895; retired from I.C.S. in 1897; President, Lucknow Congress session, 1899, Revenue Minister, Baroda State, 1904-06; member, Royal Commission on Decentralization in India, 1907-08; Prime Minister, Baroda State, 1909; author of *Economic History of India under early British Rule, 1757-1837*, *Economic History of India in the Victorian Age, 1837-1900*, d. 1909.

them and in carrying their goods, but that was necessary in order to maintain the system and to keep the Railways going. Among the great benefits conferred by the British rule on India are Railways, Posts and Telegraphs. Now, Sir, that they do confer some benefit, no reasonable man can deny. But how can you help it? Do they not benefit you more? Where would you be without them? They are really intended to keep you here, that is the primary object. Having been established with that object these things have to be kept going, and they cannot be kept going unless they serve the public also.

Then, Sir, I come to the treatment of Indian passengers. Who in this House has not seen cases of gross ill-treatment of passengers in railway trains and at railway stations? Sir, in my younger days, I was an athlete—I hope I have not yet lost all my strength. My friends of those days know how many tussles I have had—I did not believe in non-violence then—at railway stations and in railway carriages when I came in contact with some overbearing Britisher travelling with me. I have seen Indian passengers travelling by third class packed in railway trucks and wagons, not even like cattle, but like sardines. (*A Voice: "Without any oil added to them"*) On this point, I will only draw attention to one passage in the Acworth Committee's Report at pages 54 and 55. This is what they say:

"So long as the present shortage of funds persists serious hardship is unavoidable. But when it comes to overcrowding as a constant everyday affair, carried to the length that members of the committee have seen with their own eyes—passengers by regular trains perched in the luggage racks and in suburban services hanging on outside or squatting on the steps of the coaches, it is another matter. Serious measures must be taken to deal with it."

The report further on says:

"We were told by the Agent of the East Indian Railway that the Railway Board had recently disallowed any capital expenditure, even to provide such things as installation of additional water supplies or erection of waiting sheds, as they did not directly improve the movement of traffic. Whatever the shortage of funds, we cannot think that if an order so sweeping as this was given it was in the general interest."

This the committee were told by the Agent of the East Indian Railway. It is a compliment paid by one of their subordinates to the Railway Board. All that the Railway Board is concerned with is the movement of the traffic, the helping of the importer and the exporter by carrying his goods from the various important ports at the sacrifice of the personal comfort of Indian passengers and at the sacrifice of the internal trade of the country:

"Whatever the shortage of funds, we cannot think that if an order so sweeping as this was given it was in the general interest."

That is putting it very mildly as of course the Acworth Committee was bound to do.

Then, Sir, we come to the fares. There was an all round enhancement for the first time, as far as I have been able to ascertain, in 1917. That enhancement was called a temporary enhancement and it was promised to be with-

drawn after the war by Sir George Barnes<sup>1</sup> in the debate which took place in March 1918. It has not been withdrawn to this day. Now, Sir, what is the explanation that has been given by my Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes? He says that there is such an increase in the travelling public of the third class that there will be a great loss if any reduction is made. He says in his speech at page 9:

"If there were no increase of passenger traffic, even a reduction of half a pie per mile in 3rd class fares would cost us  $4\frac{1}{2}$  crores of rupees. Secondly, even assuming that there was a large increase in passenger traffic, it is certain that we should not have sufficient coaching stock to carry the increased traffic."

It comes to this, that the gates of the slaughter-house are wide open; the sheep run into it without any effort being made to catch them or bring them in, and as long as they keep running into it, nothing further need be done.

Then, Sir, we come to the manipulation of freight rates. That has been done in a manner to prejudice, as I have already said, the Indian trade. And here I will read only a few lines from the Report of the Fiscal Commission:

"Paragraph 127. Broadly speaking, the charge is that the rates are so framed as to encourage traffic to and from the ports at the expense of internal traffic. This means an encouragement of raw materials and to the import of foreign manufactures to the detriment of industries, which often have to pay what are described as unfair rates both on their raw materials transported from other parts of India and on their manufactured articles despatched to the various markets."

Now, Sir, this was denied by the Railway Board. As to this denial the Fiscal Commission say in their Report:

"We cannot believe that these complaints are entirely without foundation. In spite therefore of the sympathetic attitude of the Railway Board and in spite of the fact that this question has already been dealt with by two important Commissions within the last four years, we think it necessary to refer to the matter briefly in the hope of emphasising points which appear to be accepted generally in theory, but do not always seem to be translated into practice."

In fact, it was pointed out in the complaints that actual conditions were quite inconsistent with the policy enunciated in the Railway Board Circular. These complaints were made to the Railway Committee in 1921 and again to the Fiscal Commission in 1922. For further information I would refer the

<sup>1</sup>George Stapylton Barnes; b. 1858; Comptroller of the Companies Department of the Board of Trade, 1904-11; Comptroller General of the Labour Department of the Board of Trade, 1911-13; Joint Parliamentary Secretary, 1915; member, Royal Commission on Sugar Supplies, 1914, Viceroy's Council, 1916-21; d. 1946.

House to the speech made by Sir Vithaldas Thackersey<sup>1</sup> in the debate which took place in the old Legislative Council in the year 1912.

Now, Sir, we have had Resolutions about the grievances of railway employees, we have had the sleepers scandal discussed, we have had the locomotive industry absolutely destroyed simply by an act of breach of faith on the part of the Railway Board. I would refer the House to page 173 paragraph 19 of the Tariff Board's Report on the protection of steel where they deal with the last mentioned matter. A company to manufacture locomotives came into existence on the assurance of the Railway Administration that a certain number of locomotives would be ordered every year but that undertaking was never kept though it was on the strength of that assurance, as the Tariff Board found, that this company was able to raise its capital.

Then, Sir, there is the stores purchase policy. I will not go into it at any length. I find an amendment by my friend Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas on the subject. But I shall tell the House the most recent thing that I have heard. It is that, after giving a bounty to the Tata's on rails, some Railways,—I think they are the East Indian Railway and the Bengal Nagpur Railway—are buying continental rails at prices somewhat lower than Tata's. Now, Sir, it is a matter of history that, whenever there was competition between English steel and continental steel, English steel was preferred although it was dearer than the continental steel. But when there is competition between continental steel and Indian steel, then the plea is put forward, we must go to the cheapest market. Is it not possible to adjust the prices in some way between the Railways and the manufacturers in India? But who cares?

Then, Sir, I come to the recommendations of the Lee Commission being adopted by the Railway Board in anticipation of Government sanction. My friend, Sir Charles Innes, says at page 4 of his speech:

"I should also mention that 26 lakhs have been provided in the Budget for the cost of extending to officers of Company Railways the Lee Commission concessions with effect from 1st April last. We have thought it prudent to make this provision in the Budget, but I must make it plain that it has not yet been decided whether these benefits should be conferred on the officers of Company Railways in whole or in part. It is a question which still has to be considered by the Government of India and the Secretary of State. If allowance be made for these additions to our expenditure, it will be seen that we hope to keep the direct cost of operation, if anything, below this year's figures."

Now, Sir, what does that come to? Here is our Agent in our commercial concern. He takes it upon himself to assume the role of the prudent manager

<sup>1</sup>Sir Vithaldas D. Thackersey; b. 1873, business magnate, political thinker and social reformer; initiated into business, 1891; elected to Bombay Municipal Corporation in 1898, President, 1907; member, Bombay Legislative Council, 1903-10; elected President of Bombay Millowners Association in 1905; started Bank of Baroda, 1909, and Bombay Central Cooperative Bank, 1911; member, Imperial Legislative Council, 1910-13; Chairman Bombay Backbay Reclamation Scheme Committee, 1912; started the Dwarka Cement Company, 1920; member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1921-22; took a leading part in the establishment of Sydenham College of Commerce and Economics, Bombay; d. 1922.

and to assign no less a sum than 26 lakhs of rupees in order to make the recommendations of the Lee Commission applicable to company officers. Now, I ask the House whether it was possible for these officers ever to dream of claiming any such allowance from the companies which employed them? Is it prudent management by the Agent on behalf of the principal to throw away the principal's money by giving advantages to the servants who neither under the terms of their employment nor under any code of justice, equity or good conscience are entitled to it?

Then, Sir, there is the age-old complaint of the Indianisation of the Services. There have been some steps taken, I know, but would not one expect, at this time of day when the Railway Administration has been working for the last three-quarters of a century, that the whole of the railway staff would be manned by Indians? You began too late. My friend, Sir Charles Innes, says that a new spirit is abroad now. I thank him for the new spirit, though I do not know whether to thank him or the spirit. But why did not that spirit come a long time ago instead of only just coming into existence? And even now we have only an assurance that it has come. I know that the time since September last has been short. The Resolution we passed in the September session about Indianisation has been treated in the speeches of my friend, Sir Charles Innes, and my friend the Chief Commissioner of Railways, whom I welcome on his re-entry in this House to-day, as being no part of the September convention as it is called. It was certainly as good a Resolution of the House as any other. You say, we have not had time to act upon that Resolution. Well, I ask when will the time come? Is there again a paucity of men? I do not overlook, Sir, what has been stated in the official speeches that I have just referred to about the new institutions that have recently been founded. But my case is that these institutions should by this time have become old institutions and should have turned out thousands of qualified men. Now, Sir, I will not go into any other matters specifically relating to the activities of the Railway Board. All I want to show is that the instances I have given are instances not of slight or carnal negligence but of culpable negligence and persistent disregard of the interests of the employer by the Agent. Here we are in this House representing the principal. Here is the Agent, who does not admit any responsibility to the principal. These are the acts which have been done by the Agent, all to the detriment of the Indian tax-payer. What is the master to do with such an agent?

Sir, there are about 200 cuts on the various demands which have been proposed in the various motions before the House. They are really 200 arguments in support of the motion which I have the honour to move before you. I need not go into them in detail but, if Honourable Members who have proposed those cuts believe in them, if they believe that they are reasonable, I fail to see, Sir, how they can say that the motion I have now the honour to move is not reasonable. If the administration of the Railway Board has been such as to merit all the censure that these motions imply, I say that Railway Board must go and give place to a better and a more responsible one.

Sir, these are the reasons upon which I ask the House to vote with me upon this motion. I beg the House to consider very seriously the position

which has arisen. What is the remedy? Do you approve the railway policy which is followed by the Railway Board or do you not? How can any Member of this House who does not endorse the policy of the Railway Board vote against my motion, I for one fail to understand. Is it not true that an adverse vote on this motion means the approval of the general policy of the Railway Board? (*Cries of "No."*) I shall wait to hear the reason for that "no". How can you possibly have the effect given to your motion which my motion is intended to bring about by merely moving cuts. That is the old, old habit of a time when this Assembly and the provincial Councils had quite a different set of gentlemen to represent their constituencies. The time has gone by. If you are not going to do it now when are you going to do it? One objection that I have heard mentioned in the lobby is "Well, the General Budget is coming. This is a matter really upon which you have to censure the Government of India. Wait for the General Budget and then you can take such action as you think necessary." Now, Sir, I say that that is a wholly incorrect view of the procedure. If the railway policy is not to be criticised on the Railway Budget, I submit that the time for criticising it will never come. The framers of the Demands have attached a note to those Demands and they indicate that any cut or criticism based upon the general railway policy is to be brought under Demand No. 1, the Railway Board. I want to know what is the measure of the cut which represents a mild censure, that which amounts to drawing attention to a minor matter of policy and that which draws attention to a major principle. Is everything to be done under Rs. 100 cuts? Does it not imply, I say again, that you do not object to the very principle upon which the Railway Board is exercising its irresponsible authority? However, Sir, it is a matter on which my friends are entitled to have their own opinions. I am entitled to have my own opinion.

Now, Sir, before I sit down, let me make one more appeal to the Honourable Members of this House. So far as the Swaraj Party is concerned, I need make no appeal. The Swaraj Party has considered the matter. The Swaraj Party has definitely and deliberately approved of the motion that I have put before this House and the Swaraj Party will of course as one man vote in support of it. But I ask Members who are not members of the Swaraj Party, to consider very carefully whether it is or it is not the case that the railway policy followed by the Railway Board deserves the severest condemnation. If it does, then what action is possible what action is conceivably adequate than the one I have taken? Remember, I say again, that every single vote cast against my motion is a vote of approval of the railway policy. (*Voices: "No."*) It is. My friends may laugh at it as something very ridiculous. I say that they appear to me to be most ridiculous when they say "No, no." But when you say "I will do the same thing by touching up the Railway Board with a feather; why do you take up this big stick?" I say, "Because the Railway Board deserves the stick and not the feather."

Now, Sir, I need not engage in this desultory conversation. I have had my say and of course Honourable Members will have their say. But I do ask them, and I seriously ask them, to consider and weigh carefully all the consequences

which flow from an adverse vote upon my motion.

I did not. My friend has no right to say that.

It is a wrong impression.

May I rise to a point of order . . .

May I rise to a point of explanation? The Honourable Sir Charles Innes is hopelessly misrepresenting me in everything that he has said. He has said that I would do without a Railway Board. I never made any such suggestion; on the contrary I said that we can do without an irresponsible Railway Board and that we want a responsible Railway Board.

...  
In view of the last two speeches it is necessary that I should make the position of my party perfectly clear. Unfortunately for us official frowns and official smiles have absolutely no effect upon us. There is no doubt that my Honourable friend Sir Purshotamdas has been considerably affected by what he called the sympathetic speech of my friend Sir Basil Blackett. But there is some doubt in the mind of my Honourable friend Mr. Jinnah and he wants it to be removed by a further assurance in the specific terms which he has stated from my Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes. I may say once for all that neither the statement of my Honourable friend Sir Basil Blackett nor any statement that may be made by Sir Charles Innes will change our attitude in the least degree on this motion. It is a motion for a mild censure and as the bigger motion for severer censure has failed because we were in a minority we shall again risk a defeat but will not give our assent to the withdrawal of this motion.

### 300. *The Railway Budget—List of Demands, 27 February 1925*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru: So far as I have been able to understand my friend the Honourable Sir Charles Innes, he is prepared, in fact he has offered, to withdraw this item from the Budget. When that is done there is nothing more to be said about it and the motion made by my friend Mr. Kelkar falls to the ground. The Demand, I understand, is withdrawn so far as it relates to this item. The Demand includes this item which forms the subject of the motion of my friend Mr. Kelkar and the idea as I understand is that the Demand to that extent be withdrawn, to be put up again before this House in the form of a supplementary demand later on when it is ripe to be considered by this House after being sanctioned by the Government of India. It will then be time of course to take any objection which may arise on the merits.

...  
What I meant is this. If the demand itself is withdrawn, then there is nothing for us to quarrel about or to vote upon.

<sup>1</sup>The *Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. V, Part II, 16th February to 6th March, 1925*, Delhi, 1925, p. 1716.



301. *The General Budget—List of Demands, 6 March 1925*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru : May I ask, Sir, if you are going by the amount of the cut. If that is so, my motion is for a cut of Rs. 79,3000. Will my motion be taken along with this? It relates to the same matter, item No. 7.

May I now inform you and the House that it refers to the same matter as Mr. Kasturbhai's, namely, cotton excise.

The motion that stands to my name is:

"That the Demand under the head "Customs" be reduced by Rs. 79,300."

I have in the first place to explain how I arrive at that figure. At page 5 under the head 'Cotton Excise Establishment' we have a total of Rs. 77,000 for Bombay. Then at page 8 we have similarly the cotton excise establishment for the Central Provinces totalling Rs. 2,300. The amount by which I propose that this Demand should be cut is therefore the total of these two figures, namely, Rs. 79,300. I am afraid it was my Honourable friend Mr. Kasturbhai Lalbhai's parochial patriotism which confined his attention to Bombay. I am interested in the total abolition of this tax and have therefore taken whatever establishment exists in any province for collecting this tax.

Now, Sir, so far as the merits of the motion are concerned, I am sure that this House, at least the non-official element in it, does not need to be convinced of the imperative necessity of adopting this motion. The reason why I sent up this motion and why I am now standing to support my friend Mr. Kasturbhai Lalbhai, is that I desire to express my admiration of the high and mighty attitude adopted on this question by the Honourable Finance Member. Here is an iniquitous tax which has disgraced this civilized administration for nearly 30 years. It is a tax on production of one of the most essential necessities of life. But in spite of the deep and continued resentment of the people, in spite of the ceaseless war waged against it by the Indian National Congress in the Press and on the platform, in spite of the fact that Prime Ministers, Secretaries of State, Governors General and even Finance Members have admitted the nefarious character of this impost, in spite of the fact, Sir, that this House very recently passed a Resolution condemning it, we find the Honourable the Finance Member absolutely unmoved. I congratulate him on this most wonderful feat. It needed all the courage that he could command to introduce a Budget which has all the appearance of a prosperity Budget without offering the least explanation why this obnoxious tax was retained. In his long speech introducing the Budget not a word was said upon that point. Then followed the general discussion on the Budget. Speaker after speaker rose in his place and condemned the tax. But all that had no effect upon the Honourable the Finance Member. He rose and made a speech in reply but did not meet the arguments advanced. Not that he did not attempt to wriggle out of many other uncomfortable positions in which he found himself; for

<sup>1</sup> *The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. V, Part II, 16th February to 6th March, 1925, Delhi, 1925, pp. 2045, 2047-50, 2091.*

instance, he referred to the thorny question of exchange and currency, he referred to the political loan to Persia, or was it a loan to the Anglo-Persian Oil Company (*The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett*: "No, no.") to enable them to declare big dividends? My Honourable friend says, "No." Had it not that effect indirectly? There is no answer. (*The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett*: "No.") There is a belated answer—"No". Well, I shall leave it at that. The Honourable Member also attempted to answer certain serious charges made by my Honourable friend, Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas, about hiding away erores of surpluses in the darkest recesses of his Budget, and when Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas and some other Honourable Members were ungenerous enough to interrupt him by questions, the Honourable Finance Member suddenly discovered the value of time, although, Sir, you will remember that you were pleased not to include him in the time limit imposed upon this House. Whenever an inconvenient question was put under those heads, an answer was attempted and when it failed at a certain stage, it was given up to be dealt with on some future occasion. But the excise duty never came in for a single observation (*An Honourable Member*: "Of course it did.") in his reply. Well, it was just a passing reference. No attempt was made to justify the tax. At least, as far as I was able to follow my Honourable friend's speech I saw no justification of the cotton excise in it nor even a serious attempt to justify it.

Now, Sir, it is unnecessary for me to go into the history of the question. It has been discussed threadbare on the floor of this House and elsewhere. I will not detain the House by quoting the authorities. I have already referred to, namely, the Prime Ministers, Secretaries of State, and so on. But I shall act on the principle that one gentleman in office is better than ten out of office. In saying so I am merely putting a common saying in parliamentary language. I will therefore deal with such explanation as has been given on a former occasion by both the Honourable the Finance Member and the Honourable Member for Commerce. What is that explanation? I shall first refer to the speech of the Honourable Sir Charles Innes in which he says—that was in the September session at Simla:

"I say that there is no Britisher in India who does not regret that this tax was ever put on, and I say with confidence that that is the feeling of everyone of us on this side of the House. Also, Sir, I should like to say that we on this side of the House recognize that there is a natural desire on the part of Indians that the cotton excise duties ought to disappear from the face of the Statute-book. But, Sir, I must safeguard myself. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I regret very much that this tax was ever put on because I believe that the tax has done us great political harm. But I am not prepared to go further and say that I believe that this tax has seriously harmed the Bombay cotton industry."

Now, Sir, that last observation is a matter which I leave to be settled between the Honourable Sir Charles Innes and my friend Mr. Kasturbhai Lalbhai. I am not at all concerned with what has harmed the industry or what has benefited it. All that I am concerned with is that this obnoxious tax, which is a disgrace to the administration and a humiliation to the people of India, must go at any cost whatever happens. Then, we have the Honourable Sir Basil

Blackett at the same Session. He says:

"It was, I think, a tax bad in its origin, bad in its incidence when first imposed, and, when the 'Taxation Committee comes to inquire into it now, I think it will very likely say that it is a tax which even now is not altogether desirable in its operation."

Then, he proceeds:

"I should not be averse to being the Finance Member in whose period this historic wrong was righted."

Now, that being so, what was it that prevented my Honourable friend from righting that historic wrong? The answer is, want of funds. He says that there is no hope this year, and goes on:

"There is no hope next year, or the year after next, or the year after that that we shall be in a position both to get rid of the cotton excise duty and to give up the provincial contributions . . . We are not in a position to-day to consider on its merits whether it is the first tax that in the interests of the people of India ought to be got rid of, or whether it is desirable to get rid of it and put another tax in its place. We are not in possession of the facts, nor would it be in order to discuss that sort of question in full here. We are asked therefore on political considerations to tie ourselves to a point of view which it is impossible for us to discuss fully and which I do urge this House to consider may not be in the interests of the people of India as a whole."

So that it comes to this, that both the Honourable the Finance Member and the Honourable the Member for Commerce expressed very noble sentiments and entirely agreed with all that had been said by their predecessors as well as other high functionaries and the public, but they said there was a difficulty which could not be overcome, and that was that they did not know which of the two things, namely, provincial contributions or this tax, must go first. Now, Sir, I do not for a moment mean to be understood to say that I desire the omission of the reductions which have already been made in provincial contributions; on the contrary, I say that these contributions too must wholly disappear at the earliest possible moment. But it does not follow that because there are two wrongs, therefore we must partially right one and leave the other entirely alone. It comes to this, that the tax is a bad one, it is bad in its inception, bad in application, bad in incidence, bad altogether. But we cannot remove it because we are short of funds. May I, Sir, suggest a revival of the slave trade and making it a commercial concern, just like the Railways? That would bring much more money than this tax can. What have we got to do with the history of the shortage of funds in the past? As I have said on the present occasion that question does not arise. We have the hidden away crores. We do not know where they are.

My friend does not know and I can understand the reason why. It is because he is so constantly in the habit of hiding it away that he has forgotten where he put it on each occasion. The whole point is whether this House will be a party to a continuance of this policy of the Government which sets public opinion at naught and treats with contempt the considered opinions

and Resolutions of this House. I stand here, Sir, in order to press the total abolition of the excise duty on no other consideration than this. I ask the House, at least the non-official Members, each and every one of them, to dismiss every other consideration from their minds and to vote for this motion on the sole ground I have taken, namely, the highly objectionable nature of this tax and connected with it the treatment which this House and public opinion has received at the hands of the Government. I would ask even those who on the last occasion during the September Session of this House voted against the Cotton Excise Resolution to vote in favour of this motion. The reason why I ask them to do so is that however much any Honourable Member may be against any particular proposition which is put before the House, when that proposition is once passed by the House, it is as much a point of honour, a point of self-respect, for him who voted against it as for those who voted for it to enforce the decision of the House. It is on that point that I rest my case to-day. I may at once say that if my friend cannot find the crores that are lying about here and there, let him tax the incomes of these very mill-owners as much as he pleases and I can give him my promise that, if it is a reasonable tax, he will have the heartiest support of myself and my party. Let him do anything which is reasonably called for under the circumstances to allow of the abolition of this duty and we shall be satisfied, but I would not for a moment let it be understood that I mean any alteration in the position which provinces have taken and have been taking for some time past in the matter of their contributions to the Central Government. Nor do I mean to say that fresh taxation should be such as would kill the industry. My friend Mr. Kasturbhai Lalbhai has given rather a sad account of the prospects of the industry. I have no materials, Sir, nor have I the necessary facts before me either to support or to contradict him, but if he is right then certainly no measure taken by the Government which will kill the industry will have any assistance from us. Within reasonable bounds tax the rich man as much as you can and we shall always be found standing by you. But when the poor man is taxed or it becomes a question of the honour of the country, the honour of this House, you shall find no support from us.

...

I am sorry to differ from my Honourable friend Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya. I do not think any useful object will be served by the postponement of the vote on this motion. The motion now before the House stands on an entirely different footing from all other motions that will come before the House from time to time during this week or the next. The decision on this question, I submit, on the grounds which I have put before the House does not depend upon any of the considerations which my Honourable friend Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya has mentioned. It must be decided on its own merits. For these reasons, Sir, I object very strongly to the adjournment.

302. *The General Budget—List of Demands, 12 March 1925*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru : Sir, like my friend the Honourable Mr. Ashworth I come also from the United Provinces. He comes with a mandate from the Government, I come with a mandate from the people. I enjoy the suffrage of the people, my Honourable friend is here by the sufferance of the Government. That is the difference between him and me. I stand here to support the motion under discussion on behalf of the people, who, according to my friend the Honourable Mr. Ashworth, will be very much prejudiced if this motion is passed. Why do I do so? Not because I do not press the claim on behalf of the people as strongly as Mr. Ashworth does for the reduction—I may say, the total abolition—of the provincial contributions. As I made it perfectly clear in my speech the other day on this motion, we do not want any remission of the excise duty at the expense of the provinces. We say that both of them are bad and that both of them must go. It is pleaded on behalf of the Government that it is not possible in the present state of the central finances to abolish both the contributions and the excise duty. In fact, it is said that the reductions that are proposed in the contributions will be materially prejudiced if even a half per cent reduction in the excise duty is made. Now, Sir, I am not for any reduction of the excise duty however large. I say that the excise duty is a disgrace to the country, a greater disgrace to those who levy it than to those who pay it. The disgrace must go. I am not aware of any mathematical formula or calculation by which one can strike percentages or determine degrees of disgrace. Either it is a disgrace or it is not, and on that basis I ask for the entire abolition of this duty.

My Honourable friend Mr. Ashworth said that whatever sting there was in it was removed by the imposition of the import duty. What does it mean? It means this that the disgrace is there but the party disgraced is given a comfortable couch to lie on and compensated in other ways. I for my part, refuse to appraise disgrace in terms of rupees, annas, and pies. If it is a disgrace it remains a disgrace whether you keep the whole of the excise duty or reduce it to one pice. If the lowest duty remains it is as great a disgrace as the full duty.

I have to say only one word to my Honourable friends in this House. The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett has repeated the oft-played game of trying to raise a conflict where none exists and thus attempting to divide the vote of those who are wholeheartedly in favour of the abolition of this excise duty. He raises the bogey of the continuance of the provincial contributions and says that that is the only means open to us by which we can allow any reduction of the excise duty even to the extent of half per cent. Now, I would beg the House not to be influenced by that consideration at all. If it is not possible to do both, which I do not admit, then let the responsibility for continuing this disgrace lie with the Government. Let them say, "We cannot be parties to our own disgrace and therefore we will not help you." We do not ask you, and I make it perfectly clear once again, to touch the reductions of provincial contributions. It is for you to make the two ends meet. We have

<sup>1</sup>The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. V, Part III, 7th March to 24th March, 1925, Delhi, 1925, pp. 2193-94.

suggested various means of making the two ends meet. If none of them appeals to you, it is you who will be responsible for continuing this disgrace. I ask the House to vote without paying any attention to the threat that reductions of the provincial contributions will be omitted if this House passes the motion. I would ask every Indian who values his honour above considerations of money to vote for this motion.

### 303. *The General Budget—List of Demands, 13 March 1925*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru : Sir, I do not think I can make any profitable contribution to this debate at this stage. The question has been thoroughly discussed and if I rise in my place it is simply because I find that there was a desire among the Members of my Party to speak on the subject. On that question we have conferred with each other and it has been decided that if I stand and make the position of the whole Party quite clear in the House it will not be necessary for other speakers from this side of the House to follow. Now, Sir, I need only say one word as to that, and that is that the Swaraj Party agrees fully in the strongest condemnation of the Government policy as regards opium. I need not repeat all the arguments. We associate ourselves with the very able speech of my friend the Honourable Dr. Datta<sup>2</sup> and of the other speakers who have followed him. There was some misapprehension about the motion of my friend Mr. Duraiswami Aiyangar but I have had a talk with him and I have advised him to withdraw his motion about total abolition because in any event we must provide at least for the cultivation and manufacture of opium for the purposes for which the House has restricted it, that is to say, medicinal and scientific purposes. But it will serve no purpose, Sir, if my friends who have got small cuts and my other friends who have got big cuts all insist upon them. So long as the opinion of this House is made perfectly clear, and that I think has been done in the speeches that have been delivered, it will be waste of time to take up all cuts. I would therefore ask my friend Mr. Duraiswami Aiyangar, if Dr. Datta will adopt the amendment of my friend Mr. Ramachandra Rao, to withdraw his motion.

### 304. *The General Budget—List of Demands, 14 March 1925*<sup>3</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru : I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Executive Council' be omitted."

<sup>1</sup>*The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. V, Part III, 7th March to 24th March, 1925, Delhi, 1925, pp. 2268-69.*

<sup>2</sup>Dr. S.K. Datta, b. 1878; educated at Punjab and Edinburgh Universities. Professor of Biology and Principal, Forman Christian College, Lahore; Y.M.C.A. Welfare Officer in France with Indian Army, 1914-18, National Secretary, Y.M.C.A., India, Burma and Ceylon, 1919-27; member, Lindsay Commission on Christian Higher Education in India, 1921; President, All India Conference of Indian Christians, 1923, 1933 and 1934; member, Unity Conference, 1924, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1924-26, first Asian on the Staff of the World's Committee of Y.M.C.A.s, Geneva, 1928-32; attended the International Missionary Conference in Jerusalem, 1928 and the Pan-Pacific Conference in Honolulu, 1929; member, Second Round Table Conference, 1931; d. 1942.

<sup>3</sup>*The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. V, Part III, 7th March to 24th March, 1925, Delhi, 1925, pp. 2344-52.*

One of the grounds on which my motion or rather leave to move the adjournment of the House was refused by you yesterday was that there will be an opportunity under this head as well as on another head to speak upon the very same subject. Now, Sir, this motion really is a very comprehensive one and covers the whole field of the administration. In fact, Sir, it is a motion of censure on the Government of India and as such it covers very large ground indeed. I shall therefore take the question which was the subject of my motion for adjournment later on at its proper place and deal with this motion as a whole. As I have already said this is a motion of censure on the Government of India, on the whole of that administration. I base my motion on the constitutional ground of refusal of supplies to a Government which has forfeited the confidence of the country. I know, Sir, that there is a difference of opinion on the point among Nationalists. So far as we Swarajists are concerned, we are perfectly sure in our own minds that this is the ground upon which to put this motion. It may be that in a certain section of the House this ground may not be approved but the fact remains that whether you call it obstruction, whether you call it refusal of supplies or whether you call it merely a protest against the action of the Government, the country is thoroughly dissatisfied with the present administration and the motion in its nature and scope remains a motion of censure. I can understand that we cannot, as we are constituted, give effect to this or for the matter of that to any other motion even if it is carried by the House, but I wish to make it clear that the circumstances which have given rise to this motion are such that if we had the power to cut down all supplies we would have done so. If we cannot do it to-day it is not our fault. We cannot do it simply because you have disabled us from doing it. But the will is there to be enforced as soon as we possibly can and the Swaraj Party takes its stand upon this ground to declare and emphasise that will. It may be, Sir, that it is merely at present a mental attitude, but a mental attitude on a question like this is of the highest importance. It is not merely a protesting frame of mind: it goes much further. It goes to the extreme limit that is permissible under the constitution. Now, Sir, that being so, I do not think that any purpose will be served by my going at any length into the different viewpoints from which this question is to be considered. Those who have the time and the inclination to do so may engage in the unprofitable task of weighing these different mental attitudes in golden scales if they like. So far as we are concerned, it is enough that the Government stands condemned to-day at the bar of public opinion. I wish therefore very briefly to lay certain facts before this House which will show that at this time of the day it is not possible for this House, if it is to do justice between the Government and the country, to refuse to pass this motion.

Now, Sir, I shall briefly sketch the events which have happened under the present regime. The history of the present Government begins in the year 1921, but the history of the trouble goes back a couple of years earlier. In 1919 there were a very large number of Indians who had been sentenced to various terms of imprisonment for political crimes. In December 1919 there was a Royal clemency, and early in January 1920 a large number of these were released. Then, Sir, came the Special Congress in Calcutta in September 1920. It is very

well-known that the non-co-operation resolution was for the first time passed at that Special Congress, and that resolution was confirmed in the following December at Nagpur. After that, we find that in the years 1921 and 1922 there was a complete lull so far as revolutionary crime was concerned. I do not wish to go again into the question as to what that lull was due to. It will be for the future historian to chronicle the real causes. Of course the Government give the credit to their repressive laws; we give the credit to the non-co-operation movement. In December 1922 came the Gaya Congress when there was a split among Congressmen, and the Swaraj Party was founded in January 1923. In February 1923 the Swaraj Party gave out to the world its programme of entering the Councils in order either to mend or to end them. Well let me now very briefly review the events which followed. That declaration, as soon as it was made, received a reply from the Government. The reply was that in May 1923 and in the succeeding months a series of cases were instituted in Bengal beginning with the Kona murder case. I have no hesitation in again characterising the more important of these cases as entirely false. In fact the Kona murder case and the Alipore conspiracy case, to mention only two, were held by the courts which tried them to be false, and in the case as put by the prosecution no political element in the crime was made out. (Mr. K. Ahmed: "What has that got to do with the Executive Council?") (A Voice: "Everything.") (Turning to Mr. K. Ahmed) Who is responsible for it? Are you? Then, Sir, the Swarajists were busy with their own domestic quarrels up to the middle of September 1923, when the Special Congress at Delhi passed the Resolution permitting Council-entry. What was the reply? In the latter half of September 1923, we find Regulation III of 1818 put into force in Bengal, and a number of persons, mostly Swarajists, taken under that Regulation, including the editor of the proposed paper *Forward* and the editors and managers of other Swarajist vernacular papers. Then came the election manifesto of the Swaraj Party, dated 14th October 1923, offering open battle to the bureaucracy; and that was followed in January-February 1924 by the actual entry of the Swaraj Party into the various Councils and this Assembly. The first important measure which was passed by this Assembly on the 18th February 1924 was the well-known Resolution on self-government, which, as the House is aware, was passed by an overwhelming majority. In the course of the debate the Government disclosed their policy. It was decided by the Nationalist Party that the response so made was highly unsatisfactory, and then followed the treatment of the Budget in the manner with which the House is familiar and the throwing out of the Finance Bill. I have already referred to the lull which prevailed in the country in 1921 and 1922. As Lord Lytton put it in one of his speeches, it was because the revolutionaries were then content to stand by and watch the development of the non-co-operation movement. Now it seems that their patience was exhausted, and there was political crime in Bengal. Then we come to the Bengal Council deadlock. On the 24th March 1924 the Ministers' salaries were rejected and when they were put up again before the Council in August following, they were again rejected. Meanwhile the Reforms Inquiry Committee was constituted and the Government Communique was published, I think it was in May 1924. Well after the Ministers' salaries were rejected for the second time in the Bengal Council,



namely, in August 1924, we come to the next important date, the 25th October, the date of the Ordinance. This Ordinance was passed soon after this House was adjourned on the close of the Simla Session. Over sixty Swarajists were taken and a regular reign of frightfulness inaugurated in the country. This Assembly had during the Simla Session quietly proceeded with its labours. It had passed many important Resolutions. To mention only two of them, there was the Lee Commission and there was the Taxation Inquiry Committee, both of which came in for a full criticism by this House, and the House expressed its mind unequivocally by passing Resolutions condemning both by large majorities but to no effect. Then, Sir, we come to the present session. I am only hastily going through the events to show the connection of cause and effect. We had the Ordinance debate which is fresh in our minds. The next important thing was the Reforms Inquiry Committee report and as to that the House has been gagged. It was said that it was impossible to announce the provisional policy of the Government during the present session and therefore Government were not prepared to give a day for the discussion of this most important matter. But it was also alleged that before any final action was taken this House would have an opportunity of discussing the report of the Reforms Inquiry Committee. Well, Sir, the provisional policy must be based upon something and we know exactly upon what it is going to be based. We know that His Excellency the Governor General is going to England at the invitation of the India Office to consult with them on the situation in India. It is not merely a holiday trip, which no doubt His Excellency richly deserves, but it is a business trip. What will happen there? There will be consultations between His Excellency and the Secretary of State and I suppose also the other members of the British Cabinet, and in those consultations His Excellency and the Cabinet will not be unassisted by other expert help, if I may so call it, from India. I find that by a fortuitous coincidence a galaxy of Indian administrators will be present at or about that time. We shall have Sir Harcourt Butler, Sir Henry Wheeler<sup>1</sup>, Sir Frank Sly, Sir John Kerr<sup>2</sup> (Voices: "No.")—he has come back, I take it—but his absence will not matter much—Sir William Vincent,<sup>3</sup> and last but not least, my Honourable friend

<sup>1</sup>Henry Wheeler; b. 1870; Deputy Secretary, Finance Department, Government of India, 1907-08; Secretary, Royal Commission on Decentralization, 1908-09; Financial Secretary, Government of Bengal, 1909-12; Home Secretary, Government of India, 1912-16; member, Governor's Executive Council, Bengal, 1917-22; Governor, Bihar and Orissa, 1922-27; member, Secretary of State's Council, 1927-37; d. 1950.

<sup>2</sup>John Henry Kerr; b. 1871; Settlement Officer, Bihar, 1899; Collector, Midnapore, 1904; Deputy Secretary, Government of India, 1907; Revenue Secretary, Government of Bengal, 1911, Chief Secretary, Government of Bengal, 1915; member, Bengal Executive Council, 1921-22; Governor, Assam, 1922-27; Acting Governor, Bengal, 1925; d. 1934.

<sup>3</sup>William Henry Hoare Vincent; b. 1866; served in Bengal in various capacities in Executive and Judicial branches; officiated as Judge, Calcutta High Court, 1909-10; Secretary, Legislative Department, Government of India, 1911-15; member, Lieutenant Governor's Executive Council, Bihar and Orissa, 1915-17, member, Governor General's Council, 1917-23, Vice-President of the Council, 1921; member, Secretary of State's Council, 1923-31; d. 1941.

Sir Basil Blackett (*An Honourable Member*: "And Mr. Hindley<sup>1</sup>." Mr. Hindley too (*An Honourable Member*: "Sir Campbell Rhodes.") These will be the veteran experts in the special art of governing India, and those first named by me the stalwarts in the preservation of law and order in this country. My friend Sir Basil Blackett of course has not had directly to do with the preservation of law and order in the country, but he will go there smarting under the cuts which this Assembly has inflicted on him. [*The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett*: "Especially in the sinking fund."] Now, Sir, it is said the results of all these discussions will only be provisional, which means liable to change by the vote of this House. Is there any Member of this House who would believe in that? I can very well visualise what will happen at that round table conference. We asked for a round table conference and we have had it with a vengeance now. At that round table conference, Sir, what will happen will be this. I can see it as clearly as if I were present there. If any suggestion of a real solid advance is made, we shall find at once Governor after Governor repudiating all responsibility in the matter. He will say, "I cannot go so far; I shall not be responsible if these powers are to be given to the Legislatures in India." (*Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar*: "Who will make the suggestion?") Somebody will do it, either Lord Birkenhead or somebody else. My friend will allow me to remind him that there is enough suggestion of that kind in the minority report and that certainly will be before them. So, there is no lack of suggestion and I have not so entirely despaired of the British Cabinet, the British Parliament and British statesmanship generally as to think that there is not one man in England capable of suggesting a real advance in the Legislatures of this country. Well, that suggestion will be met by the threats I have mentioned. What can any Secretary of State or any Cabinet do when the man on the spot says, "I am not in a position to carry this out"? Well, the whole idea will be dropped. The meeting will break up in London, all the Governors will go back to their respective capitals and after all this the so-called provisional policy of the Government will be put before this House for discussion. Now, Sir, what impression would the vote of this House make upon that provisional policy? Not even the impression which the squeak of a rat makes on any Honourable Member on the Government benches when he hears it in his bed room. But I go further. This House is admittedly powerless but what can Parliament itself do? Is it or is it not true that the Conservative Government at this moment has an unprecedented majority in the House? Is it or is it not true that no Government in power can really be afraid that if a very important measure like this is once settled by the Cabinet it will be thrown out by Parliament? Parliament will simply refuse to go into the matter. It will be enough for them to know that those who are charged with affairs of this kind have come deliberately to certain conclusions. We all know what the amount of knowledge of Honourable Members of both Houses of Parliament is about India. They will be quite right. I do not blame them. The Cabinet has men in

<sup>1</sup>Clement Hindley; b. 1874; Engineer, 1897-1914, Secretary, 1914-18, Deputy Agent, 1918-20, Agent, 1920-21, East Indian Railway; Chairman, Commissioners for the Port of Calcutta, 1921-22; Chief Commissioner of Railways, Railway Board, India, 1922-28; Chairman, Steel Structures Research Committee, 1929-36, d. 1944.

it who represent the party in power and not like here, gentlemen, very amiable and good but forced upon us against our consent. Well, I say that that provisional policy would be as final as any policy can be. In fact, it will be stereotyped for some years to come. And then what will happen in India? While these consultations and confabulations are going on there, what will happen here? That has been envisaged by my Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes. In India, Sir, a great battle will be fought on the field of Allahabad. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief or his successor, if His Excellency goes away in the meanwhile, will lead all the land and air forces of His Majesty and meet my humble self with my 45 gallant Swarajists, all unarmed, and a great battle will be won to the eternal glory of British Arms. That is what will happen here. We are asked to wait and watch and it has been suggested by certain kind and well-meaning friends that there is nothing to prevent us from going to England and presenting our case there. Now, Sir, I for one disdain any cavedropping at Downing Street. Unless we are asked to take an honourable part in any consultations, I do not think that any Member from this side of the House will ever dream of going to England simply for the sake of getting scraps of information here, there and everywhere and trying to convince the British public which, as I have already observed on several former occasions, is wholly unapproachable to us, as I know to my cost. Now, Sir, the Government may be so utterly devoid of imagination as to think that this fine distinction between "provisional policy" and "final policy" will deceive anybody. But we know what things are in reality. The most interested party will go wholly unrepresented and judgement will go against us by default. What will be said of us? Well, I can also picture that to my mind. "Look at these Swarajists," it will be said, "they are impossible men. They have no constructive policy of their own. They have not even taken part in the Reforms Inquiry Committee. The leader of the party in the House was asked to be a member of this committee and through sheer cussedness he declined. Then, throughout the proceedings of the Reforms Inquiry Committee not one Swarajist either appeared as a witness or submitted his memorandum or opinion in writing." This will be the impression created. A veil will be drawn on the real facts. Why is it that we did not take part? Our attitude has been fully justified by the reports both of the majority and the minority of the Reforms Committee. As the facts are not well-known, I take the liberty to read the answer I gave to the invitation which I received from the Government to be a member of this Inquiry Committee. This is what I said on the 3rd of June. I read from a press cutting:

"I have carefully considered the terms of reference to the proposed Committee and have come to the conclusion that no inquiry within the limits, scope and extent prescribed can yield satisfactory results. It will no doubt be possible for the Committee to discover the difficulties arising from or defects inherent in the working of the Government of India Act and the rules thereunder and suggest remedies within the limitations laid down. But it is obvious that no such remedies can meet the requirements of the situation. A reference to the terms of the Resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly on the 18th February 1924 will show that the action contemplated by the Resolution must necessarily go beyond the struc-

ture, policy and purpose of the Act, and that the object in view cannot be served by merely rectifying any administrative imperfections. The proposed inquiry would perhaps be justifiable if its real and avowed purpose were to collect evidence to be subsequently placed before a representative conference constituted in the manner described in the Resolution of the Assembly with unrestricted powers to propose such changes in the constitution as the circumstances required. But as I read the press communique it commits those who agree to serve on the committee to the structure, policy and purpose of the Act and gives no indication of any intention to hold a subsequent conference with wider powers or to take any action beyond that necessary to rectify administrative imperfections under the Act and the rules as they stand. For these reasons, while thanking the Governor General in Council for the invitation, I regret my inability to serve on a Committee constituted in the manner and for the purpose set out in the press communique."

Now, Sir, this Committee did meet and it came to certain conclusions and made its report. That report, I submit, has fully justified the position that I took. There is the majority report and there is the minority report. So far as the majority report is concerned, I thought that I was reading some administration report, something like what is issued year after year by the heads of the departments relating to their own departments. I see no indication in it of any attempt to reach the root of the question. Of course, there was the formula before the Committee—"not to go beyond the structure and the purpose of Act"—and therefore any attempt in that direction was abandoned on the plea that it would not be within the scope of the inquiry. Then, when they came to discover defects and imperfections, they acted just like one who inspects an office and after going through the books and files recommends changes of procedure and transfers of certain routine items from one head to another head, and things of that kind. The only real recommendations of any substance did not go beyond the transfer of such things as the Indian Law Reports, Boilers and Gas and Forests where they are not already transferred and Excise in Assam where it is not a transferred subject. Now, the whole joke of it becomes quite apparent when you read that report in conjunction with the Resolution which was passed by this House and the debate which was held on that occasion showing the objects with which this Inquiry Committee was constituted. This Committee undoubtedly was a thing which the Government had done in response to that Resolution. Sir Malcolm Hailey from his place in this House made it clear twice—once in his opening remarks and then in his concluding speech—that all they were prepared to do was to explore possibilities. But the intention was to get at the bottom of the trouble and not merely to provide a sort of an eye-wash by adding something of no consequence or transferring one or two items of no importance and thus to throw another sop to the country and see if it can be satisfied. What Sir Malcolm Hailey said was that if it was found that no substantial advance could be made, which was desirable, within the structure and the scope of the Act, then he said "I give you no undertaking whatever. It will be a matter to be considered when the occasion arises." I quite admit that he did not commit himself to anything particular if it was

found that nothing could be done within the scope of the Act itself. But surely the fact that nothing could be done within the scope of the Act could not have been a revelation to the Reforms Inquiry Committee or rather the majority. It did not require a prophet to tell us at the time that it will be so. We knew that nothing was possible and therefore, Sir, so far as the position we took is concerned, both the majority and the minority reports have fully justified it.

This is hardly an occasion when I should detain the House by going fully into the merits of the recommendations of the majority report, or those of the suggestions contained in the minority report. All I shall say for the present is this that the majority report is a mere camouflage and the minority [report] does certainly contain things with much of which we agree and with much more of which we do not agree. At the end the only substantive conclusion arrived at is that it is a matter which must be gone into either by a Royal Commission, or through some other agency. We had ourselves suggested a more suitable agency and we are no wiser today than we were when the Reforms Resolution was passed by the House.

Now, Sir, there is one part of the majority and the minority reports which I must deal with as it very seriously affects the Swaraj Party, and in which I find that both of them have gone hopelessly wrong. I refer to the question of disqualification under the rules from membership of this House and the Councils on the ground of conviction for an offence involving a sentence of more than six months. Now, upon that point both the majority and the minority have, in a fit of generosity, extended the term of imprisonment, which would be a disqualification, to one year. That is to say, if a sentence is for more than one year, the disqualification remains, but when it is for a less period there will be no disqualification. Now, Sir, I am not at all surprised at the majority coming to that conclusion, but am greatly surprised at the minority, which consisted of most eminent lawyers like my friend Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and my Honourable friend Mr. Jinnah having agreed in that conclusion. They were perhaps caught napping and did not fully realise what they were agreeing to. It is no doubt a rule of English statute laws based on Parliamentary practice and precedent that the disqualification applies on conviction for certain offences involving a sentence of more than one year, but it was overlooked that that disqualification attached to the person while he was actually undergoing the sentence and not after he had suffered the sentence, or had been pardoned for the offence. It is a very elementary principle of criminal law that an offence is purged by undergoing the punishment for it, and it is on that principle the English practice is based. Even convictions for high treason are treated in that way. That is to say, if the sentence imposed has still to run, you cannot elect the person who is undergoing that sentence. But once he has served out the sentence there is nothing to prevent his election because it is for the electorate to judge whether the man is fit to represent them or not. What is provided against is that the electorate must not put the Government in a false position. When the Government holds a person in jail and they elect him it would create difficulties, and to avoid that, that rule was framed. Now, Sir, the rule as it obtains in India came up for consideration before the Parliamentary Joint Committee. It was discussed from the

27th May 1924 to the 1st July 1924, and it was discussed at the recommendation of the Government of India, the recommendation being that the disqualification should be removed. That recommendation in its turn, Sir, I flatter myself to believe, was based upon a Resolution which was tabled in this House very early in the beginning of the 1924 session, but unfortunately has not yet been favoured by the ballot and come up for discussion in the House. However that may be, the recommendation of the Government of India was there, and on that recommendation discussions were held in the Joint Committee on various dates. Witnesses were examined, among whom Lord Meston was one, and I will only read what was resolved at the final sitting:

"Then it was moved by Lord Clwyd<sup>1</sup> that the Committee shall advise the Secretary of State for India to adopt the proposal of the Government of India to amend the rules made under the Government of India Act, 1919, so as to remove the disqualification for five years which the rules at present impose upon any person against whom a conviction by a criminal court involving a sentence of transportation or imprisonment for more than six months is subsisting."

—note that the motion was to remove it altogether.—

"On the question whether the proposed motion be agreed to the contents were 10 and the non-contents were 5."

In spite of that Resolution of the Joint Committee, which was based on the recommendation of the Government of India themselves, we find the majority and the minority both falling into the error that I have mentioned. Now, Sir, it is an error which very deeply affects us. As is very well-known, it is we, the Swarajists, who come under that disqualification, and not only ordinary Swarajists, but men like Gandhi who is disqualified, men like Lala Lajpat Rai and Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru who are disqualified. There are numerous others who are disqualified but those I have named need no introduction in this House or outside it. And so far as that goes, in the early manifesto of October 1923, which I had the honour to issue, there was a challenge to the Government to withdraw the disqualification before the elections, and see the result. I now challenge the Government again to dissolve this Assembly, after withdrawing the disqualification. If this is done I promise this House will contain a vast majority of Swarajists.

These, Sir, are in brief the more important events which have happened during the present regime, and the whole policy of the Government may be summed up in a very few words. If you bear in mind the dates that I have given, you will find that the policy of the Government comes to this: they give full play to their repressive laws and inaugurate a reign of terror by making indiscriminate arrests throughout the country. When they are satisfied with their own terrorism and feel confident that they have crushed out the spirit of freedom, they obtain a Royal clemency and let off a number of persons in the hope that that spirit will not revive. But what do they find? They find to their utter discomfiture that the same spirit rises again in the more chastened form of non-violent non-co-operation. What happens then? They again begin pin-

<sup>1</sup>James Avon Clyde; b. 1863, called to the Scottish Bar, 1887; Solicitor-General for Scotland, 1905; member, British Parliament, 1902-20; d. 1944.

pricks of mild repression, which is followed up by more and more severe repression, until some unbalanced youths in Bengal go mad. . . .

...

Because Bengal is more political than the United Provinces and Bengal is more sensitive, and more patriotic if you like. If you want that compliment I am willing to give it though I do not think it will be fair to the United Provinces. However in Bengal, when these unbalanced youths are driven to madness, some of them resort to crime, and the opportunity is at once taken of proclaiming to the world that there is a deep-seated conspiracy in Bengal. The Ordinance is passed, and what is done under the Ordinance? Out of 70 odd arrests made the first day, 60 of the prisoners happened to be Swarajists. In the whole round-up of Calcutta not a single bullet, not a single ounce of gunpowder, nor any material for the manufacture of bombs was found. But I need not go over the ground which was traversed in the discussion on the Ordinance. Then comes the Reform Committee's Report, but why it comes as a sort of solace to some, I do not know. There are friends in this House and outside who have great hopes at least from the fact that the minority has made certain suggestions which will perhaps be accepted by the Government at Home. As far as we are concerned, Sir, I have already submitted that we have no such hope. We shall wait and see; but what shall we do in the meanwhile? Well, I can only say that we shall go out into the country again to work among our people and to work as long as it is necessary unless of course His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief finds other occupation for us either in this world or the next. But that is the only thing that we have got to do. Now that is the whole of the policy of this Government. That is why you cannot do without repressive laws. That is why you dare not concede any substantial advance in self-government. You know all this but you forget your own traditions. You forget that the spirit of independence once born can never die, do what you like. Your repression will only recoil on yourselves. Go on trying it as long as you like. So far as we are concerned, we, I can assure you, shall never be tired of opposing that repression and of suffering whatever hardship it entails. Meanwhile all we can do is to speak out our minds clearly and fearlessly, and that is what I have attempted to do to-day. I ask the House now to take the view which I have placed before them, to accept that view and to support the motion and pass it with an overwhelming majority.

### 305. *The Indian Finance Bill, 16 March 1925*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru: May I be permitted to ask whether it is open to a Member of this House to explain the way in which he has acted in reference to a remark made by the Chair? It comes to this: You were pleased to ask for certain information and you expected certain things, which things have not happened and therefore we are not to expect from the Chair at this late hour of the night to be accommodated in any way. What you were informed of was

<sup>1</sup>The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. V, Part III, 7th March to 24th March, 1925, Delhi, 1925, pp. 2486-87.

that Mr Patel would move that the motion to consider the Bill be rejected. You were pleased to observe that your information stopped there. I beg to submit, with due deference to you and the Chair, that that did not preclude any Member of the House from rising and seeking an opportunity to speak upon the motion. When you were pleased to call upon Sir Basil Blackett to reply, one second before that, I saw about a dozen Members standing in their places and I did not hear the moving of the closure. (Voices: "The closure was moved several times.") Even if that be so, when a dozen Members are standing in their places expecting to be allowed to speak and there is also a motion for closure, I expect, Sir, that that motion would first be put to the vote.

...  
Not before Sir Basil Blackett spoke.

...  
I fully appreciate what you have said. But you will be pleased to remember that sometimes developments take place in the course of the debate which no one could have anticipated at the beginning.

### 306. *The Indian Finance Bill, 17 March 1925*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, I quite appreciate the nervousness of my friend Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas to set himself right with public opinion. He has voted on two occasions, on the 8 anna reduction and the 12 anna reduction, against the popular view and he feels he is called upon to explain why he did so. I do not know what he is going to do on the present occasion. He has not signified his intention. (Sir Hari Singh Gour: "He has. He says he is going to oppose it.") I thought he was open to conviction.

...  
I am very glad to hear that. I am glad that even the hard test which my Honourable friend Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas has laid down for himself is fully satisfied in the case of every Swarajist in this House. Every Swarajist in this House has voted against the expenditure which my friend says that the House. . . .

...  
That is why I say that even if the test proposed by my friend is to be applied, it can only apply to Members who are not Swarajists.

...  
It will not stand at all. But I begin by saying that assuming that his is a good test, quite a valid test, it does not apply to the Swarajists. They will not be doing their duty and they will not be consistent if they do not vote in support of this reduction.

Now, coming to the merits of that test, I say that I do not agree with my learned friend. What is the principle that he relies upon. The principle is this. This House has voted certain expenditure. It will be wholly unreasonable for this House not to find the supplies for that expenditure. My Honour-

<sup>1</sup>The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. V, Part III, 7th March to 24th March, 1925, Delhi, 1925, pp 2526-27.



able friend added the remark that if he had been in the position of the Finance Minister he would consider it necessary that these supplies should be given.

...

Now, Sir, I should have been glad if my friend Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas had the ambition to take the Finance Member's place a little earlier in the debate, that is to say, when he was arguing, and most effectively arguing, in this House that the Finance Minister has crores lying by here, there and everywhere. I wish him to take the place of the Finance Member for all purposes and not only for the purpose of finding supplies. I have no doubt whatever, Sir, that even amongst us, the Swarajists, there are men who, if the balancing of the Budget is left to them, would probably make the two ends meet without any salt duty at all. It is most unfair to argue that because the House has voted so much expenditure, therefore the House must also vote supplies. Now, Sir, the supplies and the expenditure both have to be controlled. It is expecting us to close our eyes and then dash forward to the place where you want us to go. For that reason I say the analogy of my friend is quite incomplete. What about the 80 per cent of the expenditure in this Budget which is non-votable? Has it the sanction of this House?

...

After the separation of the Railway Budget. Now it will be something like 52 or 53 per cent, nearer to 50 than 45 anyway. Anyhow keeping this circumstance before us, that there is 50 per cent of the Budget as to which we cannot say a word, how is any one able to say that we have passed the expenditure and must find the supplies? That is the reason why I voted for the reduction to 8 annas, that is for the reduction to 12 annas, and that is why I and my party are going to vote for the reduction to one rupee. I must say one word as to the speech of my friend the Honourable Pandit Malaviya. I do not associate myself with the appeal *ad misericordiam* he has made to the Finance Member. I do not care whether the Finance [Member] is embarrassed or not; I do not care whether he can carry on the Government or not. No taxation unless our grievances are redressed, and again I rely upon the doctrine of no supplies before grievances.

### 307. *The Indian Finance Bill, 18 March 1925*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru : Sir, I beg to oppose the motion that has just been made by my Honourable friend, Sir Basil Blackett. In doing so I wish once more to make the position of my party perfectly clear. It is true that in what I am going to say, you, Sir, as an experienced Parliamentarian will not find anything novel, but in spite of the many debates we have had upon the constitutional aspect of the question in this House, I find that there is a great deal of confusion of thought on the subject, as was disclosed in certain speeches which were made on Monday. Now, Sir, we have finished our consideration of the Demands for Grants. We have also considered the various provisions of the Fin-

<sup>1</sup>The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. V, Part III, 7th March to 24th March, 1925, Delhi, 1925, pp. 2604-11.

nce Bill. I opposed the motion that the Bill be taken into consideration on certain grounds and I now stand before you at the final stage of this Bill to oppose the motion that it be passed. This must not be confounded with anything that has been done either when we were discussing the Demands for Grants or the various provisions of the Bill itself; I say so particularly to guard against any misapprehension regarding our attitude on the salt tax. Sir, this House has reduced the salt tax duty from Rs. 1-4 to Re. 1; and if I now stand and ask the House to throw out the Finance Bill it does not mean that I am asking the House also to throw out the amendment which this House has made. That is exactly the confusion of thought which prevails in this House and that is why I stand to clear it up. (*Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal*: "It is necromancy to eat one's cake and have it too.") I shall explain that. Now, Sir, the constitutional position is quite different from the position as it arises on the provisions of the Act. We do not mean to say that the government of the day can be carried on in any country in the world without supplies. Giving supplies is eating the cake. At the same time, we say that no government in the world is entitled to supplies if it does not remove grievances before it asks for supplies. That is having the cake. So that what is so absurd to the mind of a journalist and a gentleman of varied attainments and versatile genius is not so absurd to the mind of a constitutional lawyer. On the contrary it arises from well-established rules of constitutional law which have been settled for centuries. Now, Sir, my first opponent in the last debate was my friend, Mr. Jinnah. I have got a part of his speech which has been sent to me because I happened to interrupt him on this point and therefore I shall use his own words. He says:

"In my opinion that (namely, the throwing out of the motion to take the Bill into consideration) will make the protest less effective, less dignified than the vote that we have already recorded. We have said to the Government once solemnly, honestly, seriously, and I want no mistake to be made either on this side of the House or on the side of the Treasury Bench, or outside among the public, that we condemn the policy of the Government absolutely and we have done it. Sir, I decline to be a party to a repetition of this character which in my judgement loses its dignity, loses its force."

In other words, the contention of my Honourable friend is that the truly constitutional attitude is to concentrate your attention on one point, to throw out one Demand which concerns the carrying on of the Government of India, to make your protest as strong as you can, couched in as strong language as you can use, and once that is done you have discharged your duty to yourself and to your country. But if you repeat it you will be doing something lacking in dignity, lacking in force. Now, Sir, I am sorry I cannot agree with my friend. Throwing out of the expenditure on a particular department is one thing, however essential that department may be; and the attitude which I take, namely, that of refusing supplies altogether is quite a different thing. I know my friend does not agree with me to-day about the propriety of obstruction and throwing out of supplies. I was more fortunate with him only a short time ago. I was more fortunate with him when this Assembly began in 1924 and I was also again more fortunate with him in February last when he and

I put our heads together and did agree in certain contingencies to resort to a policy of obstruction and refusing of supplies. But, Sir, there seems to be a very exciting race going on in these days between wisdom and a certain section of the House. Sometimes wisdom outstrips them and sometimes they outstrip wisdom. My friend admitted the other day that in the tactics and the course adopted in the first session of this Assembly he was wrong.

...  
I am very glad, Sir, at the explanation which my Honourable friend has given. I only said that my friend had admitted that he was wrong. Now it comes to a much graver thing when he says that the whole of his party was wrong. I accept his explanation, and will say that, the race I have referred to was between the Independent Party and wisdom and not merely between my friend and wisdom. I do not think that I need labour that point very much. But what I want to know is, how is it more dignified to protest once and then meekly submit yourself to everything that you yourself have objected to? If that is so, why was not the action taken in 1924 a quite sufficient protest to keep us going for the whole life of this Assembly? Why is it necessary to repeat it this year? Cannot we protest in public meetings, in newspapers and elsewhere? I submit, Sir, that this Chamber, I mean this Assembly, is not a place for entering either mild or strong protests. This Chamber and this Assembly is a place for action. I know that we are very much hampered in the action that we can take, but why not take such action as we are entitled to. . .

...  
We can obstruct and we are entitled to take that action.  
...

Sir, I am no believer in taking a bold stand one morning and then coming down on my knees the next morning.

My friend then said, after having gone through all these Demands, it is evident that Government must levy taxes. Government cannot go on without levying taxes and it would be absurd to throw out the Finance Bill. Now, Sir, this is the old shibboleth, the bureaucratic shibboleth, the King's Government must be carried on under any circumstances, whatever happens. May I ask my friend whether the King's Government can be carried on without an Executive Council as the Government are at present constituted? And yet, we had absolutely no compunction in throwing out the grant for the Executive Council. Can they subsist without their travelling allowances? My Honourable friend Sir Alexander Muddiman described the pitiable state of things which would happen. He described the long and laborious journey between Delhi and Simla and how they were going to travel not even by bullock carts, but walk up the distance? How can you go on without your establishment? That, as my friend himself pointed out, was the only means open to us, and therefore, we selected that particular item. The Swarajists, being more consistent and insistent on their policy, were not satisfied with the Executive Council alone. We took the other heads as well. We took the Viceroy's Household; we took the Army; we took also the Opium and several other heads, and we took a division on the Army and the Secretary of State's establishment.

...

It will be good for him at this age. Now, Sir, it is really a question of intensity of feeling and nothing more. My friend is satisfied by once raising his voice of protest, I am not. I shall protest, and not only protest, but do the utmost I can, day and night, morning and evening, year after year, day after day, while I am alive

...

I will tell my friend that when all the time I am protesting and raising my voice, I shall be spinning, spinning and spinning away. Are you satisfied now?

...

Then, Sir, I come to another part of my friend's speech. I do not wish to make much of it. There was a quarrel between Mr. Patel and Mr. Jinnab, both of whom are neighbours and friends from Bombay, and I suppose they can settle their quarrel between themselves

...

What else was it? (*A Voice: "A difference of opinion."*) There was a quarrel about what you said and what he said.

...

Do you want a quarrel to be accompanied by *lathi* blows? In plain English, if I say I have a quarrel with my friend on a certain subject, what does it mean? It does not mean that I will attack him with a *lathi*.

My friend made one thing quite clear, and that was that my friend had said before the Joint Parliamentary Committee that he had no doubt that dyarchy was bound to succeed. Of that my friend could not find any contradiction as it is in his evidence, but I do not attach any importance to it. It only shows that at one time, my friend did believe, and he had a perfect right to believe it, that dyarchy was bound to succeed and, as he himself stated, subsequent experience in the actual working of it has convinced him that it is a complete failure. In the same way, we the Congress people at one time believed that it was under the circumstances our duty to work this constitution for what it was worth, although we did not believe for a moment that dyarchy would succeed. But we said, "All right, let us give it a chance". That my friend has used against us. He has quoted a resolution of the Congress of 1919 over which I had the honour to preside. If he had looked into my speech, he would have found arguments favouring the contention which he was laying before the House.

...

Do please, by all means. I am not ashamed of the views I held at any time, Sir. I condemned dyarchy, and I challenge my friend Mr. Jinnah to point out one single word in the very long speech I delivered expressing approval of dyarchy or any approval of the reforms that were given. The position which I took, the position which the Congress took, and the position which Mr. Gandhi took was that the Act was wholly disappointing, inadequate and unsatisfactory. But what the Congress said was: Here we have Mr. Montagu, a well-intentioned Englishman, he came out to this country, he did his very best to do something for us but he has been led into an error. Let us thank him for what he did. And that was what we said in the resolution that was passed. There is not one word in that resolution approving of dyarchy or of anything else contained in that Act. I would ask my Honourable friend to go

through my speech and find out any passage which can be construed in any manner, directly or indirectly, as an approval of dyarchy. But my friend ought to know why it was that we first agreed to give dyarchy a chance and why we are now so strongly against it that we insist that it must go and go immediately. He is quite well aware of the incidents which followed the session of the Indian National Congress held at Amritsar. He is well aware of the khilafat movement. He is well aware of the debate in the House of Lords and the House of Commons on the martial law regime in the Punjab and he is well aware of the subsequent history of it. It is that which changed our minds and we said: No more of these Reforms; this system deserves no more trial and we must have our rights now. Now, Sir, as regards the position in this country I should like to draw my friend's attention and the attention of the House to a passage in Lord Durham's report<sup>1</sup> which to my mind describes the conditions through which we are passing very accurately. That related to the period just preceding the grant of self-government to Canada. It is said here:

"Having no responsible Ministers to deal with the Assembly entered upon that system of long inquiries by means of its Committees which brought the whole action of the Executive immediately under its own purview and transgressed our notion of the proper limits of Parliamentary interference."

This is in regard to the Assembly that was in existence before the Parliament in Canada was established.

"Having no influence in the choice of any public functionary, no power to procure the removal of such as were obnoxious to it merely on political grounds, and seeing almost every office of the Colony filled by persons in whom it had no confidence, it entered on that vicious course of assailing its prominent opponents individually, and disqualifying them for the public service, by making them the subjects of inquiries and consequent impeachments, not always conducted with even the appearance of a due regard to justice; and when nothing else could attain its end of altering the policy of the composition of the Colonial Government, it had recourse to the *ultima ratio* of representative power to which the more prudent forbearance of the Crown has never driven the House of Commons in England, and endeavoured to disable the whole machine of Government by a general refusal of the supplies."

Now, we are passing through a period in our history very similar to that and as my friend is no doubt aware, all the Colonies have passed through a period like this. So, if there is anything which, as a constitutional matter, must be done and is required to be done to meet a case like ours, it is not the entering of a protest by throwing out this or that Demand but by boldly saying that we stand for the refusal of supplies to a Government which has forfeited our confidence.

Then I come to my friend Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas. He seemed to be weighted down by a responsibility which is not his. He said: We have now

<sup>1</sup>Report on the Affairs of British North America (1839), named Durham Report after its author the 1st Earl of Durham, John George Lambton (1792-1840). It outlined principles and schemes of British colonial policy and for many years served as a guide to British imperial policy.

passed so many items of expenditure. How can we possibly refuse the supplies to meet that expenditure? Now, Sir, I reminded him in my reply on the occasion that, if he placed himself in the place of the Finance Member, he would have real responsibility and he would find the means. My friend did not quite understand me as he thought I meant his taking the place of the Finance Member in the debate. What I meant was his taking the place of the Finance Member at the time that he was framing the Budget and then he would certainly have found those hidden away crores of rupees which he mentioned in his speech. Sir, my friend either believes in the vivid picture which he drew of the hidden crores or he does not. If he does, what justification is there for his saying that he must find the money by voting supplies? Then again, if my friend would only bear in mind what is the expenditure that he has sanctioned by his vote? Of course, I am in the happy position that I have sanctioned no expenditure. But what after all is the expenditure that he himself has sanctioned? Not more than 30 or 40 per cent of the whole Budget. What about the rest?

Now, Sir, I come to another opponent of mine but I am afraid to deal with my friend the veteran journalist, Mr. B.C. Pal. He is a freelance. In his own words "He dabbles in politics, statecraft, journalism and literature". He has evolved a principle—I don't know from which particular Chamber of his brain it has emanated, whether that stored with politics or the statecraft or journalism or literature. The principle that he has evolved is that the moral spokesman of the people of India was His Excellency the Governor General and that as His Excellency was going to England, was being invited by the Home Government to discuss the situation in India, it was for us to put facts and materials before him so that he may be able to discharge his duties as the moral spokesman of the people of India. (Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: "Moral, I think, not noble.") I said moral. (Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: "Yes, I did not hear. Make it clear.") (Mr. K. Ahmed: "He says immoral.") Now, Sir, I am not aware of any such doctrine as the one which has been propounded by my friend about the Viceroy being the moral spokesman of the people of India. But, however that may be, I do not really see what bearing it has on the question of refusal of supplies. My friend said that we Swarajists were worshippers of the idol of the market place. Well, he will pardon my saying so but he is the greatest votary of that idol. (An Honourable Member: "He was.") He was and he will be again, I am sure. (Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: "If you go to the market place.") My friend will let me remind him of some of his former speeches. Sir Valentine Chirol<sup>1</sup> says that "Mr. Pal himself admits this Swaraj is fundamentally incompatible with the maintenance of the British connection." At another place—this is on page 12 of Sir Valentine Chirol's book. . .

<sup>1</sup>Valentine Chirol, b. 1852; educated in France and Germany; travelled in Europe and Asiatic Turkey, Egypt, Persia, the Far East, United States and British Colonies; Berlin Correspondent of the *Times*; succeeded Sir D.M. Wallace as Director, Foreign Department of the *Times*; came to India as correspondent of the *Times*, 1905-06; member, Royal Public Service Commission, 1912; stayed in India from January 1916 to August 1917 on account of the law suit brought against him by B.G. Tilak for defaming him in his book, *Indian Unrest*, d. 1929.

...

I will give you your own words, Sir. Here they are:

"If we have really self-government within the Empire, . . . the Empire would cease to be British. It would be the Indian Empire and therefore this ideal, the practically attainable ideal, of self-government within the Empire is a far more impracticable thing to attain than even our ideal *Swaraj*."

And then you lay down a programme, Sir, and these are your words again:

"Let our programme include the setting up of machinery for popular administration and running parallel to but independent of the existing administration of the Government. In the Providence of God we shall then be made rulers over many things."

That was the peroration. Now, Sir, I have spoken of the race between wisdom and some of my friends of the Independent Party. While most of us are going forward, I find that my friend Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal is making a rapid descent first from complete independence to Dominion self-government and then from Dominion self-government to absolute surrender and entrusting his case entirely to His Excellency the Viceroy as the moral representative of the people including himself. (Mr. K. Ahmed: "He does represent.") These were the arguments that were advanced. But I cannot do better than remind the House of what my Honourable friend Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya said on a similar occasion last year. That sums up the whole of my case.

...

I do not know whether he is in the habit of prophesying, but he did make a true prophecy. I will read it to you. After a very thorough criticism of the administration, he says on the constitutional aspect:

"So long as the Government of India is not revised, therefore, I find that with my sense of self-respect, with the little conscience that God has given me, I cannot support taxation either now or in future. Take away the Government of India Act if you please. That is a threat which has oftentimes been uttered by not very responsible, thinking people, but take the Government of India Act away if you so please. We shall not complain of it; but if you must govern India in the forms of civilised government, let reality be introduced in place of the sham that you have established here."

Then again, I will read another short passage. This is the final peroration of my friend while winding up his remarks:

"We cannot lend our moral support and vote to the maintenance of this taxation unless the representatives of the people of this country have a voice in the expenditure of the money raised by taxation, unless we are put in a position to exercise the same rights and privileges which the members of every Legislature in the world exercise. Unless that is done, we cannot support such taxation. I hope the reasons that I have given will satisfy every elected Member of this House of the justice of the attitude I have taken, and I hope they will lend me their support in order that the present system may be ended as soon as possible, and that we may have a regular system of responsible government under which the

representatives of the people, men who have the entire confidence of the people, may carry on the administration of the domestic affairs of this country "

That was the position taken up by my friend. So long as the Government is not responsible, the Executive is not responsible, to us, so long as we do not have our own voice in the raising of taxation, we are not going to allow you any supplies. That, Sir, is the position, which is as good to-day as it was in the year 1924. In fact, if there was one reason in 1924, there are a thousand reasons to-day. After all, what has happened in this interval? I will not take up the time of the House in going into those events again. I have done so already in my former speech in this very debate. But I do say confidently that the reasons which existed in the year 1924 have been multiplied a thousandfold during the interval. For this reason I would ask the House if they want to be consistent to themselves—those who voted at least on the last occasion for the throwing out of the Finance Bill—to vote for precisely the same reasons again for the throwing out of this Bill.

...  
You must go.

...  
No, not on present lines.

...  
You should not govern as you are doing now.

...  
Not in the way in which it has been going on.

### 308. *The Special Laws Repeal Bill, 19 March 1925*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, I have only one word to say on this controversy. I think, as my friend Sir Chimanlal Setalvad put it, we are working at cross purposes. I do not think any amendment is necessary to carry out the purpose either of Mr. Jinnah or of Sir Chimanlal Setalvad. If there is any enactment which refers to any of the repealed Regulations and Acts, then I take it, Sir, as a canon of interpretation that that repealed Regulation or Act is revived by reference in that enactment. That is to say, the reference will stand good although the Act referred to may be repealed. Any reference in an Act which is not repealed to a repealed Act would ordinarily leave the provisions of the repealed Act unaffected for the purposes of the unrepealed Act and the said provisions would still be available on the correct interpretation of both Acts. That is how I understand it, Sir.

<sup>1</sup>The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. V, Part III, 7th March to 24th March, 1925, Delhi, 1925, p. 2706.



309. *The Indian Finance Bill, 21 March 1925<sup>1</sup>*

Pandit Motilal Nehru: I rise to oppose the motion. This House after a full-dress debate reduced the salt duty from Rs. 1-4-0 to rupee one. We are now asked to reconsider our decision, because the Council of State has again restored the original duty which was proposed by the Government. Sir, the action of the Council of State was expected and fully anticipated when we came to our decision. Nothing new has happened. No new facts have been brought to light. No new arguments have been advanced. It is the same old story of provincial contributions *versus* salt duty. We, Sir, refuse to recognise these as rival claimants. We want our food and we want our salt to eat it with. The relief to provinces is the food which the provinces require and the relief in salt duty will give them the salt they want to eat it with. But we are told by the Treasury Bench, who consider themselves the salt of the earth, that we can only have one or the other. Now, Sir, we feel that we shall not be true to our salt if we did not insist upon both. We have satisfied ourselves that you can give us both. You can find all the money you need for your own purposes. You can find over a crore of rupees to carry out the recommendations of the Lee Commission and you can find money for a hundred other things. You have a huge military expenditure. The least retrenchment if you were only so minded would give you all the money that you require to give relief in both the directions that we seek. At any rate we refuse to make a choice between these two, both of which are absolutely necessary. The choice will be yours, and not ours. I think, Sir, that that sums up the whole position and I need not take up the time of the House at any length. Sir, I oppose the motion.

310. *The Bengal Criminal Law Amendment (Supplementary) Bill, 23 March 1925<sup>2</sup>*

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, I take this early opportunity to explain the attitude of the Swaraj Party in regard to this Bill. Sir, we look upon it as a vicious measure designed to achieve in an underhand manner what the Government know they cannot achieve by adopting a straightforward course. Sir, it is a trap, a well-prepared trap, with a very tempting bait laid on which no lover of justice and fair play can find it easy to resist. It is an iniquitous Bill which, while pretending to concede a right, a most valued right, really strikes at the very foundation upon which that right rests. It is a sordid attempt to deceive this House into the belief that it is securing some small measure of justice for the innocent victims of the bureaucracy while in truth and in reality the House would only be helping the bureaucracy to tighten its hold upon those unfortunate men and to deprive them of what little protection they still enjoy. Sir, these are obviously very grave and serious charges. But the Government stand

<sup>1</sup>The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. V, Part III, 7th March to 24th March, 1925, Delhi, 1925, pp. 2716-19.

<sup>2</sup>The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. V, Part III, 7th March to 24th March, 1925, Delhi, 1925, pp. 2805-08.

convicted out of their own mouth. Let us recall to our minds the leading features of the dirty history of this the dirtiest piece of work that any Government has ever engaged itself upon. The House and the public know under what circumstances the Ordinance was promulgated and I do not propose to detain the House at any length on that part of the history. Suffice it to say that opportunity was taken to promulgate this Ordinance at a time when this House had just risen and when it was not to re-assemble for some months. When the House did re-assemble, it was gagged. Honourable Members will remember that I gave notice of a Bill which it was the statutory right of this House to consider, a Bill to supersede the Ordinance. Under section 72 this House and this House alone had any right to deal with the Ordinance in any manner. That right, Sir, was tried to be availed of, that right was denied to this House. I say, and I say after due consideration, that this House has been cheated out of its statutory right to interfere with that Ordinance. Section 67(2)(iii) is the only provision in the Government of India Act which allows an Ordinance either to be repealed or to be controlled or amended in any way, and that power is confined to this House to be exercised with the previous assent of His Excellency the Governor General. That assent was refused to me and the Bill therefore could never come up before this House. But what happened was that about the beginning of January or February—the date does not matter—the Bengal Council was called upon to pass an Act embodying almost word for word the provisions of the Ordinance. The Bengal Council refused to pass that Act. Now, Sir, it would be a very debatable question of constitutional law whether the Bengal Council had any right on a matter of this kind to legislate at all. To my mind even if the Bengal Council had passed that Act, it would have been a nullity as it would in my opinion have been *ultra vires* of the Bengal Council to pass a sort of parallel legislation to the Ordinance which was then and which is still in force. However that may be, I simply say that it is a debatable point and I do not go further into the matter for the obvious reason that this is neither the place nor the occasion when such a question should be discussed. I leave it to the members of the Calcutta Bar and to the Honourable Judges of the Calcutta High Court to consider the question when it arises. Now, Sir, instead of this House being allowed to go direct to the Ordinance and pronounce its decision upon it, what has been done is to adopt a circuitous course by taking advantage of section 80A(3) which no doubt gives Provincial Councils the power to legislate for the purpose of amending the criminal law so far as it relates to their Provinces after the assent of the Governor General has been obtained. As I have said, the Council refused to pass the Act. Then it became by certification the Act of the Governor alone, not even of the Governor in Council, because the power under section 72E is vested in the Governor. Now, Sir, that Act was laid before the Houses of Parliament and in due course it received the assent of His Majesty in Council. His Majesty in Council could not help giving his assent. Being a constitutional monarch His Majesty of course acted according to the advice of his Ministers. That Act now comes before us, not as an Act with which we can deal but it comes before us in another way in a more insidious way. We are now to consider a supplementary Bill, a Bill to supplement the provisions of that Act. What is it that we are asked to supplement? A thing to

which we were no parties, a thing which we have denounced in unmeasured terms but we cannot say a word about the main Bill. This, I say, Sir, is an insidious attempt to get us indirectly to accord some sort of approval to a measure to which we were no parties, a measure which, as is well known, was against the Resolution of this House and the opinions expressed in the course of the discussions which took place on the Ordinance. (Mr. K. Ahmed: "Why did not you object to its introduction?")

Now, Sir, let us take a few of the clauses of the Bill. Clause 3 is what I would describe as the bait. It is a clause which gives a most valued right. The right of appeal from convictions and from the findings and sentences passed by the courts of first instance is in all countries of the world deemed to be a very valued right. But what is the right that this clause confers? It is a shadowy right. In fact, it is no right at all. The right of appeal and the value to be attached to it depend upon the right to claim a trial according to law. What are the facts here? The main Act consists of two parts. Part I lays down the constitution of special courts of Commissioners to try offenders,—but what offenders?—not all the offenders, not every one that is taken under the Act, but only such as the high and mighty bureaucracy choose to put before the Commissioners. The Government have a discretionary power. Not one of nearly 100 men who are now suffering *durance vile* can claim a right of trial before even this specially constituted tribunal, this very much crippled tribunal. It depends on the sweet will and pleasure of the bureaucracy to select anyone they like, if they are minded to select anyone at all, to go through the farce of a trial and then they are gracious enough to say, "Thou shalt have a right of appeal". I can very well understand, Sir, what is going to happen. There is no question that in a case like this, when hundreds are taken, there will undoubtedly be some who have committed some crime—and what country in the world is free from crime? It must be in the very nature of things that there would be evidence forthcoming against them. It is in the nature of things that there will be evidence sufficient not only by this special tribunal but also by the High Court to convict the man. Now, this unfortunate man will be placed before the Commissioners. He would probably have no real defence. He will be tried in the manner indicated by the Act and will be convicted. Then he will have the right of appeal. The High Court most probably will come to the conclusion that the evidence is sufficient and uphold the conviction. What will follow? What will follow will be that the case of that unfortunate man will be used to justify the arrest of the one hundred innocent men whom the bureaucracy have not the courage to try even under the limitations which they have imposed upon the special tribunal. Sir, Lord Lytton has said, and Earl Winterton has said in the House of Commons, that there is no intention of trying any of those taken on the 25th October, 1924, when the Ordinance was promulgated. I challenge my friend now to say whether they have the heart, the courage to try those who have been arrested under this Ordinance. What is the value of a right of appeal when there is no right to claim a trial? Sir, if a trial takes place under the ordinary law, with the due safeguards imposed by law, I can understand that the right of appeal is a very valuable right. But you take hold of a man and you keep him in deten-

tion, in prison, for any length of time you like. All that is needed by the Act, is that every year the Governor will revise the case, and if he is so minded, he will either set the man free or keep him for another year, and this will happen from year to year. The Star Chamber, Sir, ensured a fairer trial to the persons whom it tried.

Then we come to the other clauses. You have given us this bait and if we swallow it, what are we asked to do? We are asked to give more powers to the bureaucracy. We are asked to give by clause 4 extra-territorial jurisdiction. By clause 5 we are asked to help the bureaucracy in suspending all courts of civil and criminal justice under section 24 of the main Act. It is described by my Honourable friend merely as an interpretation clause. Yes, so it is; but how far does that interpretation go? It goes to the full length of depriving civil and criminal courts of their jurisdiction to deal with the misdeeds of the bureaucracy under the Ordinance and under the Act.

Then we come, Sir, to clause 6, which, it is stated, is the natural consequence of the Ordinance. The Ordinance had a provision of this kind and this clause, it is said, is inserted simply because the Bengal Legislature as a Provincial Legislature could not provide for the matter. I ask, is that consequence which follows as a matter of course? Does the provision not involve the refusal of a right, the denial of which cost England the head of one of its Kings? You say clause 5 is an interpretation clause, and you say clause 6 follows as a matter of course from the Ordinance. The result is as I have said, that while you give a sham right of appeal, a right of appeal which in one case out of 20 might perhaps have some little value, you deprive hundreds of persons—maybe thousands of persons,—who knows when you are going to desist from this mad career of indiscriminate arrests—of the right which they enjoy under section 491, of the jurisdiction which the High Court possesses under that section. And what is the price? The price is, you give the right of appeal in such cases as you deem fit to try. This is the whole of the Bill which we are now asked to pass. We realise, and let there be no doubt about it, we fully realise that the right of appeal, however limited, has always some value. If there is one unfortunate man who has a chance of having his case placed before the highest tribunal in the land, that is a chance, Sir, which no reasonable man will deny him. We cannot therefore oppose the whole Bill which contains clause 3. It is a cruel, almost a fiendish dilemma in which we are placed. We must recognise that there is some value, however little, in the right of appeal given by the Bill. There may be cases where there is some chance, however slender, of the poor man getting justice from the High Court. On the other hand, we are asked to barter away all the rights of the others for this little chance. Well, we are not prepared to fall into the trap. It was only the other day that much pious horror was shown in this House when my Honourable friend Mr. Goswami described the present system of Government as the devil's Government. Are these provisions, I ask, Sir, anything short of installing the devil on the high and holy seat of justice. I say it is nothing short of that. We have heard of Jedwood justice—hang in haste and try at leisure. To this the Government have graciously added the right of appeal, the nature of which I have described. Sir, we are not going to be deceived by this. Not even the man in the street will be deceived by anything like this. There-

fore, Sir, to sum up the position of my party, I say that this is an iniquitous measure, the iniquity of which is only enhanced by the right which it pretends to give with one hand and the rights which it takes away with the other. So far as that goes, as I have already said, we must recognise the little good that there is in this stingy grant of the right of appeal. Our position will be that we shall say nothing about it. We shall leave you to stew in your own juice. We shall not cast our vote either for or against but when you try to ask us for more powers we shall oppose you and we shall refuse you those powers with all the strength that we can command. That, Sir, is the position of my party.

311. *The Bengal Criminal Law Amendment (Supplementary) Bill, 24 March 1925*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru : Sir, I should like to say only two words about this motion. I should have preferred to say nothing at all and record my silent vote which would have been as eloquent as any number of speeches that I can make, but as some Honourable Members have spoken, I feel, Sir, that I should take this opportunity to make one or two observations.

Now, Sir, the first observation that I have to make is this. We have been asked today to do what we refused to do yesterday, and we are being asked to do so with a loaded pistol pointed at our heads. We are now given to understand that the provisions we have rejected must ultimately find a place in the Act. Sir, I have only to ask the House whether there is any Member of it so devoid of self-respect as to do something which it does not like when a loaded pistol is pointed at his head, something which he would not otherwise have done and which he has shown that he did not like to do by his vote yesterday.

The next point that I wish to urge is this. I took it upon myself yesterday to say that the principle object of this supplementary Bill was not to give a right of appeal, but that under cover of a very shadowy, unsubstantial right of appeal what was really aimed at was to deprive the subject of what little protection he enjoyed under the existing law. To-day, Sir, the cat is out of the bag. It was only a speculation yesterday: to-day it is a proved fact. My Honourable friend, the Home Member, in the Statement of Objects and Reasons appended to this Supplementary Bill said that the principal provision of the Bill was clause 3 which gave this right of appeal, and in his speech also he referred to that clause as the principal clause. That principal clause has been allowed to be passed by this House. But what do we find? The Government are not satisfied with that. Clauses which were supposed to be only subsidiary clauses are now being forced down our throats by a recommendation from His Excellency! They have now become essential because otherwise this procedure would not have been adopted. Now, Sir, I ask the House whether under these circumstances it would permit these clauses, which accord-

<sup>1</sup> *The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. V, Part III, 7th March to 24th March, 1925, Delhi, 1925, pp. 2869-70.*

ing to the Government were not so essential as the right of appeal to be passed over their heads in the manner that is proposed to be done? I have nothing more to say: but I again repeat that it is a disingenuous attempt on the part of the Government to deprive the subject of a right which is recognized now in England and elsewhere to be one of the elementary rights which every free citizen of every country has, namely, the right to obtain a writ of *habeas corpus*. That was the real object, and that object this House I am perfectly certain will not allow the Government to achieve.

312. *On the deaths of C.R. Das and Surendranath Banerjea, 22 August 1925*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Permit me, Sir, before we proceed to the business for the day, to mention the great national and irreparable loss that the country has suffered since we dispersed in Delhi. The relentless hand of death has removed two great and towering personalities from the public life of India and plunged the whole country in the deepest sorrow. The first victim it claimed was Chittaranjan Das, the great founder and leader of the Swaraj party. He was cut off in the prime of life, in the midst of a brilliant career of devoted service to the country. His great qualities of the head and the heart, his intense patriotism, his unbounded charity, his stupendous sacrifice, are well-known and appreciated throughout the civilized world, and I make bold to say that you will find no instance in history of a more complete self-effacement in the service of the motherland. It was at a time when his natural gifts were rewarded by a phenomenal success in life that his great soul rose above the temptation of personal gain. He spurned aside the fortune that was his and chose poverty to devote himself and his whole life to the service of the country. His patriotism, Sir, was not confined within narrow limits but was broadbased on his love for humanity. I will beg permission to lay before the House the high ideal which he put before himself in his own eloquent words. What he said in his last public utterance was this:

"Nationalism is merely a process in self-realization, self-development and self-fulfilment. It is not an end in itself. The growth and development of nationalism is necessary so that humanity may realise itself, develop itself and fulfil itself, and I beseech you, when you discuss terms of settlement, do not forget the larger claim of humanity in your pride of nationalism. For myself I have a clear vision as to what I seek. I seek federation of the States of India, each free to follow, as it must follow, the culture and traditions of its own people, each bound to each in the common service of all, a great federation within a greater federation, a federation of free nations whose freedom is the measure of service to man and whose unity is the hope of peace among the people of the earth."

Such was the Prince among men, Deshabandhu, of his loving country, who is no more. Sir, closely associated as I was with him and his work, his loss

<sup>1</sup>The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. VI, Part I 20th August to 3rd September, 1925. Simla, 1926, pp. 17-18.

is a great personal blow to me. The Swaraj Party feels the loss of their distinguished leader as they do the loss of a revered and beloved head of the family. India, in whose service he laid down his life, mourns his loss as one of her greatest sons.

The second great blow which has fallen in this interval is the death of Sir Surendra Nath Banerjea, rightly known as the Father of Indian Nationalism. He belonged to that distinguished band of patriots who established the Indian National Congress from which all subsequent activities have grown. It was he who first roused the people from their lethargy and the educated classes to a realization of their sense of duty to their country by his matchless oratory and his indefatigable work among the people. Sir, permit me to refer to a personal incident. I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to publicly acknowledge my debt of gratitude to him. When I was only a schoolboy it was he who first fired my imagination by his fervent oratory. In the later seventies he was touring the country educating public opinion to demand simultaneous examinations in India and England for the Indian Civil Service. I heard his great speech at Allahabad and so impressed was I with that speech that I followed him after that from town to town to hear and hear again his oration. In later years I had the privilege of working with him in the National Congress. In still later years I had the misfortune to differ from him on certain public questions, but whether I agreed with him or not I always had the same respect, the same admiration for his patriotism and his services to the country. Sir, I think I am voicing the feelings of all Members of the Swaraj Party when I say that we in common with the rest of India grieve for the loss of Sir Surendra Nath Banerjea to the country as the loss of a true and great patriot. I will ask Honourable Members of the House to request you to send a message of condolence and grief of this Assembly to the families of the two departed great men and to express our sympathy with them in their great bereavement.

### *313. Valedictory Speech for the retiring President, 24 August 1925<sup>1</sup>*

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, on behalf of the Swaraj Party I rise to bid you farewell, and in doing so, I associate myself with the remarks which have been made by Mr. President Patel and the Honourable the Home Member. They have more or less exhaustively dealt with the various aspects of your office, and the admirable manner in which you have discharged its duties. You have set, Sir, a very high standard, which it will be well for your successors to follow. You have discharged your duties with conspicuous ability, becoming dignity, and unfailing courtesy and fairness. When I say that, Sir, I think I say all that can be said of any President of an Assembly. We have worked under your guidance and deliberated under your guidance in this Assembly for nearly two years now. That is a long enough period to be replete with memories, and this is an aspect which I wish particularly to touch

<sup>1</sup>The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. 11, Part 1, 20th August to 3rd September, 1925, Simla, 1926, pp. 26-27.

upon as it has not been mentioned by my predecessors. Those memories must of necessity be both pleasant and unpleasant. To except them to be invariably pleasant would be to expect you or us, or both of us, to be more than human. It is in the very nature of things that in a House, the total strength of which is over 140, there should occasionally arise slight differences of opinion about the procedure followed or the rulings given by the Chair. What matters is not that such a difference should arise from time to time but the feeling that it leaves behind in its wake. I think, Sir, I can most confidently say that if any such difference has happened the feeling left behind has invariably been of complete goodwill on both sides. Sir, I do not wish to detain the House and you at any great length but I wish to conclude my remarks with expressing the regret of my Party on parting with you. The duty that we have to perform to-day is both a pleasant and an unpleasant one and when we are dealing with the unpleasant part of it—namely the parting with you, we have but one feeling and that of sincere regret. The pleasant part of it is to give you our sincere appreciation of the work you have done in an ungrudging spirit, and I hope, Sir, brief though my remarks have been, you will take it that the depth of the sentiment behind those remarks is not to be measured by their brevity. With these words, Sir, I wish you Godspeed on behalf of my Party and success in all your future undertakings.

### 314. *Welcome to the new President, 24 August 1925<sup>1</sup>*

Pandit Motilal Nehru : Sir, I beg to accord you a most hearty welcome on behalf of the party which had the honour of claiming you up till a few moments ago and which still hopes to claim you as a member after you have discharged the functions of your new high office. Sir, you have yourself from the floor of the House spoken of the high qualities of the Honourable Sir Frederick Whyte<sup>2</sup> and you have yourself said that it will be your endeavour to come up to that standard which has been set by him. I may say at once that I am not a worshipper of the rising sun. I like to worship the setting sun, and all I can say at the present moment is that you have filled us with high hopes and expectations and that we are confident that you will fulfil them worthily.

### 315. *Motion for Adjournment, 25 August 1925<sup>3</sup>*

Pandit Motilal Nehru : Sir, I had no intention of intervening in this debate

<sup>1</sup>*The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. VI, Part I, 20th August to 3rd September, 1925, Simla, 1926, p. 34.*

<sup>2</sup>Alexander Frederick Whyte; b. 1883; Parliamentary Private Secretary to Winston Churchill, 1910-15; member, British Parliament, 1910-18; one of the founders of the *New Europe* and its joint editor, 1917-20; President, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1920-25; Head of the American Division, Ministry of Information, 1939-40; d. 1970.

<sup>3</sup>*The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. VI, Part I, 20th August to 3rd September, 1925, Simla, 1926, pp. 191-92.*



and if I rise it is simply to thank the Honourable the Finance Member for the addition he has made to my vocabulary of bureaucratic terminology. He has said, in describing the Indian gentlemen who are on the Commission, that they are gentlemen who have the courage of their convictions, because they have the courage of differing from other Indians on important questions. Now, Sir, I thought that the courage of conviction does not mean defiance of public opinion and defiance of the opinion of other Indians but it seems that it has come to acquire that meaning in the bureaucratic vocabulary. But my friend was not aware that by saying so he was really letting the cat out of the bag. We now know the reason why these gentlemen, whether they are Europeans or Indians, have been appointed on this Commission. It is because they have the courage of differing from us and differing from the views of the public in India.

It is perfectly permissible to look into the antecedents of a person whom we are appointing to a committee or whom we ask to do any other important thing. The antecedents of these gentlemen, whatever else they may be, make one thing quite certain, namely, that they have the capacity, the unbounded capacity, of defying Indian public opinion.

The next point my friend has made clear is the meaning of the term "true representation of India's interests." It is not Indians who are the true representatives of Indian interests, but those who understand Indians better than they do themselves. Now, that is an old story. It is not a new thing which has been said to-day. But it was never put as high as it has been put today. If I, standing before you here, say that I have the courage of my convictions, that I am prepared to stand by them through thick and thin, that I am prepared even to die for them that has no meaning to the bureaucratic mind. But if I go over to my friends on the other side and say, "I am very sorry; I was wrong, but I now agree with you", I then will be credited with all the courage in the world, including the courage of conviction. So also, Sir, of the true interests of Indians. We are to be saved from ourselves. That is what it comes to. Now, may I ask my friend, "Why is it at all necessary to have all these Indians here in this House? Why not fill this representative Assembly with the true representatives of the interests of India from England who surely understand our interests better than we do? The argument is that we want experts. That argument has been sufficiently answered by previous speakers. Undoubtedly experts have a place on such committees. But what are their functions? Their functions are to advise the Committee and not to form the majority of the Committee. Then it is said that it is to be an impartial Committee, but where does the superior impartiality of these English gentlemen—I say nothing against them—lie as compared with the impartiality of equally competent Indians? They may be greater experts, but I am comparing the impartiality of the one with the impartiality of the other. Surely, my friend does not mean that barring the three Indians that have been put upon the Commission, there are no other Indians who can be said to be as impartial or even sufficiently impartial to enter upon the onerous duties which this Commission involves. That being so, I ask Members of this House to bear in mind the definitions that have been laid before them. They must not attach

upon as it has not been mentioned by my predecessors. Those memories must of necessity be both pleasant and unpleasant. To expect them to be invariably pleasant would be to expect you or us, or both of us, to be more than human. It is in the very nature of things that in a House, the total strength of which is over 140, there should occasionally arise slight differences of opinion about the procedure followed or the rulings given by the Chair. What matters is not that such a difference should arise from time to time but the feeling that it leaves behind in its wake. I think, Sir, I can most confidently say that if any such difference has happened the feeling left behind has invariably been of complete goodwill on both sides. Sir, I do not wish to detain the House and you at any great length but I wish to conclude my remarks with expressing the regret of my Party on parting with you. The duty that we have to perform to-day is both a pleasant and an unpleasant one and when we are dealing with the unpleasant part of it—namely the parting with you, we have but one feeling and that of sincere regret. The pleasant part of it is to give you our sincere appreciation of the work you have done in an ungrudging spirit, and I hope, Sir, brief though my remarks have been, you will take it that the depth of the sentiment behind those remarks is not to be measured by their brevity. With these words, Sir, I wish you Godspeed on behalf of my Party and success in all your future undertakings.

### 314. *Welcome to the new President, 24 August 1925*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru : Sir, I beg to accord you a most hearty welcome on behalf of the party which had the honour of claiming you up till a few moments ago and which still hopes to claim you as a member after you have discharged the functions of your new high office. Sir, you have yourself from the floor of the House spoken of the high qualities of the Honourable Sir Frederick Whyte<sup>2</sup> and you have yourself said that it will be your endeavour to come up to that standard which has been set by him. I may say at once that I am not a worshipper of the rising sun. I like to worship the setting sun, and all I can say at the present moment is that you have filled us with high hopes and expectations and that we are confident that you will fulfil them worthily.

### 315. *Motion for Adjournment, 25 August 1925*<sup>3</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru : Sir, I had no intention of intervening in this debate

<sup>1</sup>*The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. VI, Part I, 20th August to 3rd September, 1925, Simla, 1926, p. 34.*

<sup>2</sup>Alexander Frederick Whyte; b. 1883; Parliamentary Private Secretary to Winston Churchill, 1910-13; member, British Parliament, 1910-18; one of the founders of the *New Europe* and its joint editor, 1917-20; President, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1920-25; Head of the American Division, Ministry of Information, 1939-40; d. 1970.

<sup>3</sup>*The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. VI, Part I, 20th August to 3rd September, 1925, Simla, 1926, pp. 191-92.*

Registrar, then go to the District Registrar, then go to the Civil Court and finally in appeal or revision to the High Court. It may be a very paying proposition for gentlemen in the profession, but I do not think that it is at all a convenient procedure for the public.

I therefore hope that the House will find no difficulty in refusing to allow this Bill to go to the Select Committee because if they do so they will be accepting the principle of it, and in my humble opinion the very principle upon which the Bill is based is objectionable.

### *317. The Contempt of Courts Bill, 27 August 1925<sup>1</sup>*

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, I rise to make a humble effort to pour oil over troubled waters. It seems to me that while speeches have been made from opposite standpoints, the object of the speakers is one and the same. I will not trouble the House by a speech on the merits of the Bill generally, but I shall simply make an offer based upon the suggestion which my friend the Honourable Sir Chimanlal Setalvad has made. The view that he has taken of the drafting of the Bill and of the provisions of it is the view that I also take of the Bill. I do believe that it is very badly drafted. Now, although the Preamble of the Bill and the Statement of Objects and Reasons deal with one aspect of the Bill, we find, when we read the Bill, that there is another aspect also. In fact it is impossible to say which of the two constitutes the principle of the Bill. We find that section 2 has a definition of contempt and provides a punishment for the offence which is substantive legislation. Then, we find provisions as to how to deal with cases of contempt. Now, Sir Chimanlal Setalvad has suggested that the only object aimed at is what is disclosed by the Preamble and the Statement of Objects and Reasons, namely, that the High Courts of Judicature in India which are established by Royal Charter should have jurisdiction to take cognizance of cases of contempt when committed against their subordinate Courts and that superior Courts of final appeal which to all intents and purposes exercise the jurisdiction of the High Courts in the various provinces in which they are established but were not constituted by Letters Patent, should also have the same power to deal with cases of contempt whether committed in respect of these superior Courts or Courts subordinate to them. If that was the only object, then, as pointed out by Sir Chimanlal Setalvad, it could be attained by just two simple sections: The first removing the doubts which exist as to the jurisdiction of the High Courts established by Royal Charter and the second section giving the same powers to courts which are not so established, for instance, the Judicial Commissioner's Court in Sind and other provinces. That is declared to be the only object of the Bill; at any rate should be the chief object if not the only object of the Bill. But the attempt to achieve the impossible, namely, to define contempt of court, which has not yet been defined in any part of the world, is, I think, a

<sup>1</sup>*The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. VI, Part I, 20th August to 3rd September, 1925, Simla, 1926, pp. 369-70.*

any importance to anything that may have been said against any of these gentlemen personally. As long as I was in the House I did not hear anything very exceptionable against them—but if anything has been said, pray do not have regard to it. Have regard only to the admissions of the Honourable the Finance Member himself, have regard to the fact that he looks upon the English gentlemen on the Commission as better representatives of the true interests of India than Indians themselves and the Indian gentlemen as having the courage to differ from other Indians. On these two facts, I ask Members of this House to support the motion that has been brought before them by Mr. Jinnah.

316. *The Indian Registration (Amendment) Bill, 26 August 1925*<sup>1</sup>

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, with all due deference to the legal acumen and experience of Diwan Babadur T. Rangachariar, to which a most deserving tribute has been paid by my friend Lala Duni Chand, I beg to differ from the view that he takes of this matter. I am perfectly sure that Diwan Bahadur Rangachariar knows as well as I do that a large proportion of documents which are registered in Upper India are executed by *purdanashin* ladies.

...  
I say a very large proportion, and sometimes very valuable properties are owned by Hindu widows, by Muhammadan widows and by Muhammadan married women too. The greatest difficulty is experienced by the most experienced judges in coming to a right conclusion on the question as to whether a certain document was or was not executed, and if my friend will take the trouble to consult the reports, he will find that when the High Court differs from the court of first instance on that question, their Lordships of the Privy Council find it very difficult to make up their minds as to whether the first court or the appellate court was right. That being the case I do not think that Sub-Registrars are the class of officials who are at all competent to go into the question of disputed execution, certainly not in the United Provinces or the Punjab or Bengal or the Central Provinces, wherever the *purdah* system exists. Then again, we must also note the class from which these officials are drawn. They have no judicial experience of any kind, at least in Northern India, and they are generally drawn from the revenue establishment of the districts. I will not cast any reflection upon the honesty of these very deserving class of officials. I take my stand only upon the fact that the questions which they will have to deal with will be far beyond their competence and far beyond their capacity to weigh evidence. That being so, I hope that the House will have no difficulty in refusing to place such a power in the hands of officials who have no experience and who cannot possibly exercise it to the satisfaction of the parties concerned. I entirely agree with what Diwan Bahadur Ramachandra Rao has just said that it does not conduce to public welfare to multiply these inquiries, to begin with the Sub-

<sup>1</sup>The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. VI, Part I, 20th August to 3rd September, 1925, Simla, 1926, pp. 251-56.

and incurred by the Secretary of State for India in Council on account of the Government of India.

(c) The Council of the Secretary of State for India shall be abolished and the position and functions of the Secretary of State for India shall be assimilated to those of the Secretary of State for the self-governing Dominions save as otherwise provided in clause (b).

(d) The Indian Army shall be nationalised within a reasonably short and definite period of time and Indians shall be admitted for service in all arms of defence and for that purpose, the Governor General and the Commander-in-Chief shall be assisted by a Minister responsible to the Assembly.

(e) The Central and Provincial Legislatures shall consist entirely of members elected by constituencies formed on as wide a franchise as possible.

(f) The principle of responsibility to the Legislature shall be introduced in all branches of the administration of the Central Government subject to transitional reservations and residuary powers in the Governor General in respect of the control of Military and Foreign and Political affairs for a fixed term of years:

Provided that during the said fixed term the proposals of the Governor General in Council for the appropriation of any revenue or moneys for military or other expenditure classified as 'Defence' shall be submitted to the vote of the Legislature; but that the Governor General in Council shall have power, notwithstanding the vote of the Assembly, to appropriate up to a fixed maximum any sum he may consider necessary for such expenditure and in the event of a war to authorise such expenditure as may be considered necessary exceeding the maximum so fixed.

(g) The present system of Dyarchy in the Provinces shall be abolished and replaced by Unitary and Autonomous Responsible Governments subject to the general control and residuary powers of the Central Government in inter-provincial and all-India matters.

(h) The Indian Legislature shall, after the expiry of the fixed term of years referred to in clauses (b) and (f) have full powers to make such amendments in the constitution of India from time to time as may appear to it necessary or desirable.

This Assembly further recommends to the Governor General in Council that necessary steps be taken:

(a) to constitute in consultation with the Legislative Assembly a convention, round table conference or other suitable agency adequately representative of all Indian, European and Anglo-Indian interests to frame with due regard to the interests of minorities a detailed scheme based on the above principles, after making such inquiry as may be necessary in this behalf;

(b) to place the said scheme for approval before the Legislative Assembly and submit the same to the British Parliament to be embodied in a Statute."

Sir, I have read the amendment without any comment, but in the course of

fruitless attempt. This new definition cannot be allowed to stand or to be accepted by the House even at this stage of the Bill, because, as I have said, it is very difficult to accept the principle contained in clauses 3 and 4 which lay down that the High Courts shall have the same jurisdiction in respect of subordinate courts as they have in respect of contempts of their own authority if it is to be taken with the new definition. I therefore make this offer that, if my Honourable friend the Member in charge of the Bill will agree to eliminate the new offence which he has created by clause 2 and agree to take the Bill to the Select Committee in order to secure the two principal objects which are mentioned in the Preamble and the Statement of Objects and Reasons, I would beg the House not to oppose the Bill at this stage. If however my friend the Member in charge has any objection to that course and if he thinks that clause 2 contains the principle of the Bill as much as any other clause, then in that case I shall be bound to oppose the motion.

### 318. *Recommendations of the Reforms Inquiry Committee, 7 September 1925<sup>1</sup>*

Pandit Motilal Nehru : Sir, I beg to move an amendment to the Resolution which has just been proposed by the Honourable the Home Member. That amendment runs as follows:

"That for the original Resolution the following be substituted:

"This Assembly while confirming and reiterating the demand contained in the Resolution passed by it on the 18th February 1924, recommends to the Governor General in Council that he be pleased to take immediate steps to move His Majesty's Government to make a declaration in Parliament embodying the following fundamental changes in the present constitutional machinery and administration of India:

- (a) The Revenues of India and all property vested in or arising or accruing from property or rights vested in His Majesty under the Government of India Act, 1858, or the present Act or received by the Secretary of State in Council under any of the said Acts shall hereafter vest in the Governor General in Council for the purposes of the Government of India.
- (b) The Governor General in Council shall be responsible to the Indian Legislature and subject to such responsibility shall have the power to control the expenditure of the Revenues of India and make such grants and appropriations of any part of those Revenues or of any other property as is at present under the control or disposal of the Secretary of State for India in Council, save and except the following which shall for a fixed term of years remain under the control of the Secretary of State for India:
  - (i) Expenditure on the Military Services up to a fixed limit.
  - (ii) Expenditure classed as political and foreign.
  - (iii) The payment of all debts and liabilities hitherto lawfully contracted

<sup>1</sup>The Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. VI, Part II, 7th September to 17th September, 1925, Simla, 1926, pp. 854-68.

form of the Government of India Act of 1919. In the concluding chapter of what is known as the Montagu-Chelmsford Report we have the following passage:

"Hybrid executives, limited responsibility, Assemblies partly elected and partly nominated, divisions of functions, reservations general or particular, are devices that can have no permanent abiding place. They bear on their face their transitional character; and they can be worked only if it is clearly recognised that that is their justification and their purpose. They cannot be so devised as to be logical. They must be charged with potentialities of friction. Hope of avoiding mischief lies in facing the fact that they are temporary expedients for training purposes, and in providing that the goal is not merely kept in sight but made attainable, not by agitation but by the operation of machinery inherent in the scheme itself."

Now, Sir, let us for a moment analyse this most diplomatic statement. It comes to this. We know that the machinery we provide is charged with potentialities of friction, but we hope it will be made to work smoothly. In other words we give you an unworkable machine, but you must try to work it. It was said, and has since been repeated in and out of season, that it is merely a transitional arrangement in the nature of a new experiment, and that those concerned were expected to help to the best of their ability in making it a success. I deny, Sir, that it was a new experiment which deserved a fair trial. The experiment had already been tried in Canada and had hopelessly failed. Here is Lord Durham's<sup>1</sup> description of it:

"It was a vain delusion to imagine that by mere limitations to the constitutional Act, or an exclusive system of Government, a body, strong in the consciousness of wielding the public opinion of the majority, could regard certain portions of the provincial revenues as sacred from its control, could confine itself to the mere business of making laws, and look on as a passive or indifferent spectator, while those laws were carried into effect or evaded and the whole business of the country was conducted by men, in whose intentions or capacity it had not the slightest confidence. Yet, such was the limitation placed on the authority of the Assembly of Lower Canada. It might refuse or pass laws, vote or withhold supplies, but it could exercise no influence on the nomination of a single servant of the Crown. The Executive Council, the Law Officers and whatever heads of departments are known to the administrative system of the provinces were placed, in power, without any regard to the wishes of the people or their representatives; nor indeed are there wanting instances in which a mere hostility to the majority of the Assembly elevated the most incompetent persons to posts of honour and trust. However decidedly the Assembly might condemn the policy of the

<sup>1</sup>John George Lambton, 1st Earl of Durham; b. 1792; a reformist Whig Party statesman; member, British Parliament, 1813-28, Ambassador to St. Petersburg, 1835-37; Governor General and High Commissioner in Canada, 1838; resigned, 1838; attempted public justification by means of his *Report on the Affairs of British North America* (1839), outlining principles and schemes of British colonial policy adopted by his successors; d. 1840

my speech I shall have occasion to explain the scheme and the scope of it.

I may at the very outset say that in dealing with the Resolution and the amendment together I shall confine myself to a plain statement of the situation as I see it. Let us first be clear as to what is the real question before the House. The Resolution of the Honourable the Home Member is short and innocent looking, but involves the most controversial points that are agitating the country. It is divisible into two parts, first, the acceptance of the principle underlying the majority report of the Reforms Inquiry Committee, and second, the adoption of the detailed recommendations contained therein. So far as the latter are concerned, namely, the recommendations, let me at once tell my Honourable friend that we freely make a present of them to him. I shall not waste the time of the House by referring to the recommendations except to say that some of the things recommended are undoubtedly most useful in their own way but not exactly the kind of things we bargained for. What we are trying to do is to find a place in the Sun for ourselves. If we are to have it, we shall need no recommendation from you for the things which will be ours. If we are not to have it, your recommendations will not carry us far and we can do without them. The most important part is the principle. It is not stated in the Resolution and we are left to find it out for ourselves from the text of the report. I have read that report with all the care and attention due to the authors, but I am sorry to say that I have failed to discover any principle underlying it. We have been told in effect that the principle is that something could be done under the Government of India Act and the rules made thereunder as they now stand, and that that something is to be found in the recommendations made by the majority. There is no doubt that something can always be done with everything, but the question is whether that something will meet the requirements of the situation and is worth having. That is a matter which, according to the authors, was outside the scope of the reference, and they have, therefore, not troubled themselves about it, and to-day, my Honourable friend, in moving his Resolution, has said that the Committee did not do what they were not asked to do and what they could not do. My answer is that if they were asked to do what I shall show presently was an impossibility, it was up to them to say so, and not to make recommendations which satisfied nobody. If there is any principle to be inferred from the recommendations, it seems to me to be the principle which governs the whole system of Government, and that is, "Give as little as you can and make sure that in the little you give, the power and prestige of the bureaucracy is not in the least jeopardised." But there is one question of principle which the majority have approached, though they have left it undetermined. It is the question whether dyarchy in the provinces coupled with absence of responsibility in the Central Government can under any circumstances be a sound basis of administration. This and the cognate question whether dyarchy has in fact succeeded are the two vital problems which we must face in this debate. My answer to both, if I may for once borrow the phraseology of the Treasury Bench, is in the negative. I maintain that there never was any doubt in the minds of those who invented and introduced the system or of those who would like to work it at all costs that it was wholly unworkable as such. Let us begin with the inventors who secured their patent from Parliament in the



same way as in a federal constitution, there is a corresponding horizontal division in these respects. We have, of course, no evidence to show how such a system might have worked in India. The partial dyarchy which was introduced is clearly, as stated by the Government of the United Provinces, a complex, confused system having no logical basis, rooted in compromise and defensible only as a transitional expedient."

So that the system introduced in India, whether you call it complete or partial dyarchy, is self-condemned and indefensible in its very nature. In this view one would have expected a clear pronouncement that it has not and could not have succeeded. But we have instead the following quibble for a finding of the Committee:

"While the period during which the present constitution has been in force has been too short to enable a well-founded opinion as to its success to be formed, the evidence before us is far from convincing us that it has failed."

It has not been shown to have either succeeded or failed, and therefore must go on, that is the logic: The minority, on the other hand, are very clear and precise. They say:

"Differing from the majority of our colleagues we have been forced to the conclusion that the present system has failed and in our opinion it is incapable of yielding better results in future."

Now, Sir, at this point I think it will be of interest to the House if I refer to a passage from the opinion of the Honourable Mr. Sachchidananda Sinha of the Bihar and Orissa Government, who is an Executive Councillor and not a Minister. He says in the opinion which was submitted along with the opinions of the other Members of the Bihar Government:

"... It (talking of dyarchy) is not only too complex and complicated, but one which being unknown to constitutional history is naturally unwarranted by political experience as a satisfactory solution of the problem of an efficient executive, sufficiently amenable to the control of popular representatives. In this connection, I may quote a well-known historical incident which seems to have bearing on this point. After Akbar had formally founded and declared himself the high priest of his new religion, 'Din Elahi', he asked his near relation, Raja Man Singh<sup>1</sup>, to join the new church. Man Singh said, 'Sire, I and all I have are yours. I shall gladly obey your Royal command, but if I had my option I had rather not... do so. If Your Majesty had asked me to become a Mussalman, I might have understood it, for I understand Hinduism, and I understand Islam; but I confess, I do not understand this hybrid creed which your Majesty has established.'"

That is exactly the case here. We understand various systems of government known to the civilised world or that were known to the ancient world, but this hybrid system which has been brought into being by speculative constitu-

<sup>1</sup> Man Singh, grandson by adoption of Raja Bhari Mall of Amber; entered into the service of Emperor Akbar in 1562; one of the main supporters of the Mughal Empire; was a great general, appointed to hold charge of important provinces like Kabul and Bengal, served the Mughal Empire till his death in the Deccan in 1614.

Government. the persons who had advised that policy retained their offices and their power of giving bad advice."

Further on, he says:

"... It appears, therefore, that the opposition of the Assembly to the Government was the unavoidable result of a system which stunted the popular branch of the legislature of the necessary privileges of a representative body, and produced thereby a long series of attempts on the part of that body to acquire control over the administration of the Province. I say all this without reference to the ultimate aim of the Assembly, which I have before described as being the maintenance of a Canadian nationality against the progressive intrusion of the English race. Having no responsible ministers to deal with, it entered upon that system of long inquiries by means of its committees, which brought the whole action of the executive immediately under its purview, and transgressed our notions of the proper limits of Parliamentary interference. Having no influence in the choice of any public functionary, no power to procure the removal of such as were obnoxious to it merely on political grounds, and seeing almost every office of the Colony filled by persons in whom it had no confidence, it entered on that vicious course of assailing the prominent opponents individually, and disqualifying them for the public service, by making them the subjects of inquiries and consequent impeachments, not always conducted with even the appearance of a due regard to justice; and when nothing else could attain its end of altering the policy of the composition of the colonial government, it had recourse to that *ultima ratio* of representative power to which the more prudent forbearance of the Crown has never driven the House of Commons in England, and endeavoured to disable the whole machine of Government by a general refusal of the supplies."

Thus, the experiment had been fully tried and had yielded its inevitable results when it was sought to try it again in perhaps what was considered to be a more congenial soil. The soil of India, however, proved as uncongenial as that of Canada and you have had exactly the same results. The controversy about the merits and demerits of dyarchy was started soon after the inauguration of the system and has continued since. I shall not trouble the House with opinions of responsible statesmen expressed from time to time condemning the whole system root and branch but will at once come to the Report of the Reforms Inquiry Committee. Let us first take the majority Report. On the question of dyarchy it is, as I have already said, difficult to discover what is the considered opinion of the majority. They get out of the overwhelming evidence of the utter failure of dyarchy by saying:

"It is clear that witnesses have frequently made this allegation not with reference to dyarchy itself and have been thinking not of the division of functions, which is the essential principle of dyarchy, but of other features of the constitution. Complete dyarchy was not, in fact, established. For complete dyarchy it would have been necessary to have established a complete vertical division of functions between the two halves of a provincial government, and to have endowed each half with a separate purse, with a separate permanent staff and with a separate legislature; in the

tionists is a thing which is unrecognisable, and impossible to be identified with any of the past and present constitutions of the world. Now, I have read the passage from the minority report. I do not intend troubling the House with the seven good reasons they give for their opinion because Honourable Members must have read them. We are here concerned with the conclusion at which they arrived and I would commend to the House the passage which my Honourable friend, the Home Member, has read from the concluding portion of that Report. I commend that passage to the acceptance of the entire House.

Now, we come to the high authority of Lord Birkenhead. Dealing with the question in his recent statement in the House of Lords his Lordship says:

"I myself was always very distrustful of the diarchical principle. It seemed to me to savour of a kind of pedantic and hidebound constitution to which Anglo-Saxon communities have not generally responded, and which, in my anticipation, was unlikely to make a successful appeal to a community whose political ideas were, thanks in the main to Macaulay,<sup>1</sup> so largely derived from Anglo-Saxon models."

Now, Sir, we have in the opinion of Lord Birkenhead the true instincts of a constitutional lawyer asserting themselves but strangely enough His Lordship cannot find it in him to say that dyarchy has failed. Later on in the same speech, after discussing the opinions of Provincial Governments His Lordship puts the question again to himself and answers it by saying:

"Enough has been said to satisfy my present purpose which is to show that no short or dogmatic answer can be given to the question. It has neither altogether succeeded nor has it altogether failed"—and in saying that he has taken the cue from my Honourable friend—"and it must further be noted"—this is important—"by way of additional qualification that where it has succeeded the price of the success has been at some stages and in some directions a considerable inroad upon the dyarchical principle."

To put it in plain English what His Lordship is here saying is that dyarchy has succeeded where it was not dyarchy at all. It must therefore be taken that the system has been universally condemned and yet the irony of fate is that we are held bound to it. It is said that there are objections and defects obvious on the very surface, but you must honestly and earnestly work the system and prove that it is unworkable. The Government want us to give them the Moon. We say it is unattainable. They agree but they insist on our making a vain attempt to get at it. We respectfully decline not only because the attempt is vain but also because the attempt has actually been made and has miserably failed. What is then the position? It is simply this, that you have either to give us real reforms or to go back to your time-honoured methods of autocratic

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Babington Macaulay; b. 1800; English writer and statesman; called to Bar in 1826; member, British Parliament, 1830-34, 1839-47, 1852-56, Supreme Council of India, 1834-38, Secretary of War, 1839-41; first Director of European Education for India; architect of a criminal code for India which became Law in 1860; after pursuing a political career, achieved fame through his *History of England*, d. 1859.

mending. As all India was of one mind on this point, all elected Nationalists, Swarajists and non-Swarajists including many nominated Nationalists joined in placing the national demand for full responsible government before this House. I had the honour to move a Resolution and in moving it I said:

"We have come here to offer our co-operation, non-co-operators as we are, if you will care to co-operate with us. That is why we are here. If you care to have it, we are your men. If you do not, we shall, like men, stand upon our rights and continue to be non-co-operators."

Nothing could be clearer than this. But how was this frank offer received? On the 8th February 1924 Sir Malcolm Hailey formulated the Government proposal thus. He said:

"It may be that the remedy for these difficulties will be found by using the rule-making power within the Act; I refer to the utilisation of those sections to which reference is so often made, 19-A, 45-A, and 96-B. It may even be—I can say nothing as to this—that the inquiry may show that some changes are required in the structure of the Act in order to rectify definite and ascertained defects experienced in actual working. When we have our results, and those results are ready for presentation to Parliament, then before they are finally presented to Parliament we shall ask the Secretary of State to give every opportunity for discussion in this country both in the Legislature and elsewhere. That is as far as we can go at present."

Ten days later in the course of the same debate he further explained the Government position as follows:

"If our inquiry into the defects of the working of the Act shows the feasibility and the possibility of any advance within the Act,—that is to say, by the use of the rule-making power provided by Parliament under the Statute, we are willing to make recommendations to this effect. But if our inquiry shows that no advance is possible without amending the constitution, then the question of advance must be left as an entirely open and separate issue on which Government is in no way committed. To that extent the scope of our inquiry goes somewhat beyond that originally assigned to it; but I must again emphasise the fact that it does not extend beyond that scope to the amendment of the constitution itself."

Now what was the result of the struggle so far in this House? The only consolation to be derived by this statement was that while the Government, as then advised, were not prepared to go beyond the Act, the question of the revision of the Act itself was left open without the Government committing themselves one way or another. This was small consolation for those who asked for an immediate revision of the Act. The Resolution asking for the establishment of responsible Government in India was carried by the overwhelming majority of 76 to 48 on the 18th February 1924. It contained the modest request:

"to summon a representative round table conference to recommend, with due regard to the protection of the rights and interests of important minorities, the scheme of a constitution for India."

The existence of inherent defects in the constitution was now practically con-

you are not to infer from that that we consider ourselves in any way incapable of carrying out the reservations which we make in your favour in this proposal.

Then for the Provincial Governments we ask for provincial autonomy, we want the abolition of dyarchy. We reserve our right to frame our own constitution after the fixed period during which you are to have exceptional powers has ended. The next step that we ask you to take after declaring these principles in Parliament is to constitute whatever agency you like—we have said a convention, a round table conference or some other suitable agency,—it does not matter to us by what name you call it—but it must be a representative agency, adequately representative of all Indian, European and Anglo-Indian interests. That agency is to frame a scheme with due regard to the interests of all the minorities. When this scheme is framed it is to be laid before Parliament, as was done in the case of the Dominions, and is to be followed by a Statute embodying it.

Now, Sir, my Honourable friend, the Honourable the Home Member, referred to that section of the people who stood aside when the reforms were first inaugurated and would not help in making them a success. Let me briefly touch upon the history of that section leading up to the popular demand which is contained in my amendment. When the new Legislatures were inaugurated, it is true that a very large section of the people represented in this House by the Swaraj Party stood aside and would have nothing whatever to do with them. Another section, however, offered to run the machine, and they worked wholeheartedly to make it go. But their honest and sincere endeavour was foredoomed to failure. They worked with goodwill and great ability but could not run the heavily-clogged machine, goaded as they were by liberal showers of honours and privileges. Meanwhile those who had stood apart were driven to the only alternative to an armed revolt which was open to them, namely, non-violent non-co-operation. The Executive Government which had not parted with a scintilla of its autocratic power laid its heavy hand on these non-co-operators and persecuted them to such an extent that even that Moderate of Moderates, His Highness the Aga Khan, was compelled to tell England frankly:

"You can only remain in India so long as India wills it, but you cannot govern India by giving the Garter to one man and putting another in prison."

When the appointed lives of the first Assembly and of the Provincial Councils were drawing to a close a strong body of those who had hitherto stood aside formed themselves into the Swaraj Party with the declared policy of entering the new Legislatures with a view to mend or end them. The immediate objective of the Party was stated in its manifesto to be the "speedy attainment of full Dominion status" which was explained to mean "the right to frame a constitution, adopting such machinery and system as are most suited to the conditions of the country and the genius of the people" This was to constitute the process of "mending" in which the Party was first to engage itself and if it failed, the process of "ending" was to follow. The erstwhile non-co-operators began with a fair and frank offer to co-operate with the Government if it would honestly and ungrudgingly join in the process of

absolutely clear on that point. But Lord Birkenhead appears to be equally clear that this principle cannot be applied to us. His Lordship says:

"Comfortably with the principles laid down in the Preamble one Constitution or another might at one time or another be attempted. Experience, education, or our informing critics in India might induce us to make an amendment here or an advance or a variation there, but the whole message, as we understand it, of our situation in India with all that it involves in the storied past, in the critical present, and in the incalculable future, is to be read in that Preamble."

The Preamble has all that immense importance. If this be so, then goodbye to all hope of settlement. But in view of His Lordship's clear and unambiguous announcement that no decisions have been taken and none will be taken till the Assembly has expressed itself, I take the liberty, to treat this expression of opinion as an *obiter dictum* or at best an observation by a judge in the course of a trial made with the simple object of inviting argument. Taking it in that light, I beg to refer the House to what I said on the point in the course of the debate in February 1924. I will not read it. It is a long passage, but I should like to read certain important passages to supplement the remarks I made on that occasion. They refer to what was actually done when constitutions were framed in the Dominions. I take the case of Australia which framed its own constitution to be embodied in a Statute of Parliament. What was done will appear from the following extracts from the speech of the Right Honourable Joseph Chamberlain<sup>1</sup> on the introduction of the Constitution Bill in the House of Commons on the 14th May 1900. He said:

"On the one hand, we have accepted without demur, and we shall ask the House of Commons to accept, every point in this Bill, every word, every line, every clause, which deals exclusively with the interests of Australia. . . . Wherever the Bill touches the interests of the Empire as a whole, or the interests of Her Majesty's subjects, or of Her Majesty's possessions outside Australia, the Imperial Parliament occupies a position of trust which it is not the desire of the Empire, and which I do not believe for a moment it is the desire of Australia, that we should fulfil in any perfunctory or formal manner."

That is exactly what we say. Make us masters in our own home, but whatever else is outside the home and pertains more to your Imperial interests, you are welcome to keep. Then he says:

"However great we might think the mistake that they are making, and however great we think the injury to the Empire, still we should have to act against the danger of interfering with those rights which they regard as their undoubted palladium."

Sir, you will see that the amendment which I have moved to-day not only fulfils these conditions but as a transitional arrangement allows the Secretary of State for India greater powers than the Secretary of State for the Dominions has in any self-governing Dominion. Then, take the case of the Union

<sup>1</sup> Joseph Chamberlain; b. 1836; British statesman; father of Austen Chamberlain and Neville Chamberlain; Mayor, Birmingham, 1873-76; member, British Parliament, 1876-85; Secretary of State for Colonies, 1895-1903; d. 1914.

ceded by the Government, and what could be more reasonable than for this House to ask to have a suitable constitution framed in a manner in which all rights and interests could be safeguarded? This was 18 months ago. What has the Government done in this interval? It can be summed up in one word and that is, "procrastination". There was first a departmental inquiry, about which we know nothing. Then came the Committee which my Honourable friend, the Home Member, has immortalised by lending it his name. I have already dealt with this Committee. Then we come to an epoch-making event in the history of India. His Excellency the Governor General took the trouble to go to England to confer with the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India on this momentous question. Their Lordships held many consultations and conferences at which all the materials collected by the Muddiman Committee besides those already existing in the India Office and the Government of India Secretariat were made available to them. No greater tribute can be paid to the judicial mind which both their Lordships brought to bear upon the most important questions they were considering than is implied in the fact that after months of full and free discussion they arrived at no decisions whatever and have kept perfectly open minds to give an unbiassed hearing to this Legislature. In his statement made in the House of Lords last month Lord Birkenhead is reported to have said:

"No decisions whatever have been reached nor could any have been reached. Indeed not even the Cabinet which has naturally been kept closely aware of the discussions between myself and the Earl of Reading has reached any decision. The Government is far too conscious of the implications of the Montagu-Chelmsford Constitution to find it possible even to think of the conclusions until certain indispensable antecedent steps have been taken."

And what were those indispensable antecedent steps? In a subsequent passage, His Lordship says:

"Before any decisions of any kind are taken it is obvious that consideration and advice of the Legislative Assembly must be elicited.

We should, for reasons, which are apparent, not dream of announcing or even of forming decisions without the contribution of that very important Legislative body which we have so recently called into existence. I am not, therefore, today either announcing or purporting to announce decisions or conclusions."

Now, this was a due recognition of the importance of this Assembly. We are truly thankful to His Lordship for the great consideration he has shown to us,—but I must confess to a feeling of perplexity when I attempt to reconcile this weighty pronouncement with the more or less decisive opinions expressed in the subsequent portions of the speech. For example, the effect of the Preamble to the Act of 1919 is authoritatively declared to be "permanent and static." This, Sir, is a view which we cannot accept under any circumstances, whatever. It has brought upon us all the trouble we have suffered from in the past and I may at once say without mincing words that we are prepared to undergo endless suffering in the future so long as the Government adhere to that view. The fundamental principle on which a constitution for India is to be passed must be the principle of self-determination. We are

what we consider to be our birthright by strong words from any quarter, however high. The door of co-operation is not open to threats, still less will it be stormed by force.

Then, I have in passing to deal with certain remarks which His Lordship has made on the Report of the Muddiman Committee. They are weighty remarks made in a judicial spirit of open-mindedness. Here they are:

"We do not anticipate, for reasons which have already been made plain, that we shall be able to accept the report of the minority at this stage."

This is also, of course, subject to what this Assembly might say in the course of this debate:

"The problem of provincial autonomy contemplates the complete transfer of law and order and it would render necessary far-reaching changes in the Central Government of India, which have never yet been closely analysed and very rarely even cursorily examined."

Whose fault, pray, was it that this has not been done all these years:

"It is rather on the lines recommended by the majority that any immediate action must be taken. As I have already said, we must await the formal views of the Government of India on this matter but it will certainly be the desire of His Majesty's Government to go as far as possible in carrying out the proposals which the Government of India may make after discussion in the Legislative Assembly. Many of the recommendations of the Committee can be carried out by regulation and do not require an Act of Parliament. There need be no delay in making these changes. In those cases where legislation is required, the matter can be appropriately dealt with as and when opportunity offers."

Now, Sir, all I can say is that we are not so simple as to believe that the Government of India will make any proposals of a sweeping nature. His Excellency the Viceroy has told us what these proposals are going to be, subject of course again I say to the discussion in the Assembly. I need not refer to that speech in detail as it is fresh in the memory of the Honourable Members. His Excellency has only repeated what Lord Birkenhead said about his Government being prepared to accept, without committing himself to all the recommendations of the majority, but to accept such as may be determined hereafter to be fit to be adopted. As for the minority—of course they are dreamers—His Excellency only says:

"Briefly, the minority ask whether the Constitution should not be put on a permanent basis with provisions for automatic progress in the future, and they are in favour of a system of provincial autonomy. They press for an early inquiry with a view to fulfilling these aspirations. To the subject of provincial autonomy I shall return later. It is sufficient to say at this stage that the minority, mindful of the terms of reference, do not present it as a practical and fully considered scheme, but content themselves with putting it forward as an ideal."

Well, Sir, it will be for one of the members of the minority—and there is a distinguished member to my right—to say whether he pleads guilty to the charge that what they said in the Report was not fully considered. I can quite understand that they were very mindful of the terms of reference, but I am



of South Africa which enjoyed the same privilege of making its own constitution. In the course of the debate on the South Africa Bill in the House of Lords the Earl of Crewe<sup>1</sup> made the following observations. He said:

"The movement for a federal constitution for the Colonies of South Africa which was started in 1876-77 came to nothing though 'it was inspired by high motives, but not perhaps carried out with complete understanding'. It failed in one respect, if I may adopt a phrase used by my noble friend Lord Selborne<sup>2</sup>—it failed because it was not home-made. It was suggested and was almost attempted to be forced on the Colonies from here, and consequently it was abortive."

Then he proceeds to say:

"The action of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman<sup>3</sup> in offering responsible government to the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony in 1906 was 'undoubtedly due to the general political creed held by the Government, to their more robust faith in the virtues of self-government as such than their predecessors probably had'. I do not think I should be greatly wronging the party of noble Lords opposite,"—and I may here mention that one of the noble Lords opposite was Lord Birkenhead—"if I were to say that they would prefer in the main to adopt the eighteenth century maxim,—

For forms of government let fools contest,

Whate'er is best administer'd is best."

I do not mean that Lord Birkenhead himself was present, I mean the party of which Lord Birkenhead is now a distinguished ornament. I am sorry I was not accurate. Then referring to the proposal to make alterations in order to remove glaring defects, Lord Crewe went on to say:

"But I do feel that if this change is to be made it must be made in South Africa by South Africans themselves, and that it is not possible for us, whatever we may consider to be the special merits of the case, to attempt to force it upon the great representative body which with absolute unanimity demands that it should not appear."

Now, Sir, to return to the Preamble. In concluding his remarks on the Preamble Lord Birkenhead remarked:

"We shall not be diverted from its high obligations by the tactics of restless impatience. The door to acceleration is not open to menace, still less will it be stormed by violence."

All I can say, Sir, in reply is that we shall not be diverted from the pursuit of

<sup>1</sup>1st Marquess of Crewe; b. 1858, English statesman and diplomat; Lord President, Secretary of States' Council, India, 1905-08, 1915-16; Secretary of State for Colonies, 1908-10 and for India, 1910-15; Ambassador to Paris, 1922-28; Secretary of State for War, 1931; d. 1945.

<sup>2</sup>W.W.P. Selborne; b. 1859; member, British Parliament, 1885-86, 1886-92, 1892-95, Under Secretary for Colonies, 1895-1900; First Lord of Admiralty, 1900-05; Governor of the Transvaal and High Commissioner for South Africa, 1905-10; President, Board of Agriculture, 1915-16; d. 1942.

<sup>3</sup>Henry Campbell-Bannerman; b. 1836; member, British Parliament, 1868-1908; became leader of the Liberal Party in the House of Commons in 1899; Prime Minister and First Lord of Treasury, 1905-08; d. 1908.

own is, is that unless you show a change of heart, we are not going to co-operate. (Hear, hear and loud applause from the Swarajist Benches.) The hand of fellowship was extended to you in no grudging spirit by the late founder and chief of the Swaraj Party. You have rejected it, but I am here to say that I and my Party stand by what he said. Let me remind you of what the late Mr. Das said in his Faridpur speech. He said:

"We have been gravely told that Swaraj is within our grasp if only we co-operate with the Government in working the present Reform Act. With regard to that argument, my position is perfectly clear, and I should like to restate it so that there may be no controversy about it. If I were satisfied that the present Act has transferred any real responsibility to the people, that there is opportunity for self-realization, self-development and self-fulfilment under the Act—I would unhesitatingly co-operate with the Government and begin the constructive work within the Council Chamber. But I am not willing to sacrifice the substance for the shadow. I will not detain you today with any arguments tending to show that the Reform Act has not transferred any responsibility to the people. I have dealt with the question exhaustively in my address at the Ahmedabad Congress, and if further arguments are necessary, they will be found in the evidence given before the Muddiman Committee by men whose moderation cannot be questioned by the Government. The basis of the present Act is distrust of the Ministers. At the same time, I must make clear my position,—and I hope of the Bengal Provincial Conference—that provided some responsibility is transferred to the people, there is no reason why we should not co-operate with the Government. But to make such co-operation real and effective two things are necessary: first, there should be a real change of heart in our rulers, secondly, Swaraj in the fullest sense must be guaranteed to us at once, to come automatically in the near future."

These are exactly the same sentiments which the minority have expressed in the concluding part of their report. Then the late Mr. Das went on to say:

"I have always maintained that we should make large sacrifices in order to have the opportunity to begin our constructive work at once."

Further on he says:

"It is impossible to lay down the exact terms of any such settlement at the present moment; but if a change of heart takes place and negotiations are carried on by both sides in the spirit of peace, harmony and mutual trust, such terms are capable of precise definition."

Then, Sir, if it does not happen, what is the other alternative? This is what Mr. Das has said on this point:

"If, however, our offer of a settlement should not meet with any response, we must go on with our national work on the lines which we have pursued for the last two years so that it may become impossible for the Government to carry on the administration of the country except by the exercise of its exceptional powers. There are some who shrink from this step, who point out with perfect logic that we have no right to refuse supplies unless we are prepared to go to the country and advise the subjects not to pay the taxes. My answer is that I want to create the

afraid His Excellency has not done justice to himself or to the members of the minority by saying that they had not fully considered the scheme. He proceeds:

"The steps for its attainment clearly demand further investigation."  
That is what the minority ask for:

"In effect therefore the recommendations of the minority amount to a demand for an early and authoritative inquiry with a view to a revision of the Constitution. The issue at the moment between them and the Government of India is largely one of time for the appointment of a Commission."

Now, the amendment which I have placed before the House will, I think, clarify the issue. It is not merely a question of time. It is a question of substance as to what this Royal Commission or round table conference or convention or whatever agency may be employed is actually going to do. Is it simply to come and begin at the beginning as is laid down in section 84-A of the Government of India Act? Is it to go into questions like these: What is the state of education in India? What progress have representative institutions made in India? Whether these people deserve any further progress or whether it is necessary to send them down a form or two to learn their lessons better and come better prepared for another Commission ten years later? Now, that is the sort of thing which we are objecting to. We say we are absolutely fit for self-government, as fit as you are yourself in your own Island. This is what we say. Here we are occupying that position and you tell us as you would tell schoolboys: Be good boys and you will be promoted to a higher form.

Then, it is said—and my learned friend the Honourable the Home Member relied specially upon that passage—that wise men are not the slaves of dates. I say wise men are not the slaves of Preambles either. What sanctity is there in a Preamble? Is not this Act of Parliament, the Government of India Act of 1919, just like any other Act of Parliament? Are not all Acts of Parliament the result of the experience and wisdom of Parliament? Or was any special kind of that experience and wisdom or the quintessence of all experience and wisdom infused into this Preamble? Will any lawyer tell me or, for the matter of that, any other person that any legislative authority, not to speak of the Mother of Parliaments, is not perfectly at liberty to set aside its own Act under whatever circumstances it may have been passed? Of course, I do not say that the mere fact that because we ask for it the Act of 1919 must be repealed. We say we have made out a case, which you have not answered, which you have admitted, and upon that case, whatever else may happen, the provision for dyarchy and no provision for responsibility in the Central Government cannot work and cannot remain on the Statute, unless, of course, in the confidence of your strength and brute force you want to keep us down and to force your own schemes down our throats for years to come.

Then, Sir, there is the plea for co-operation. Lord Birkenhead, His Excellency the Viceroy and my friend the Honourable the Home Member have all said that the first condition, a very clear one, is that you must co-operate with us. I say that my first condition, as clear a condition as your

atmosphere for national civil disobedience, which must be the last weapon in the hands of the people striving for freedom. I have no use for historical precedent; but if reference is to be made to English history in our present struggle, I may point out that refusal to pay taxes in England in the time of the Stuarts came many years after the determination of the Parliament to refuse supplies. The atmosphere for civil disobedience is created by compelling the Government to raise money by the exercise of its exceptional powers; and when the time comes we shall not hesitate to advise our countrymen not to pay taxes which are sought to be raised by the exercise of the exceptional powers vested in the Government."

Now, Sir, the House will please bear in mind that these are not sentiments uttered in bitterness. They were uttered at a time when the late Mr. Das was extending his hand of fellowship to the Government, and that was a time when he without the least hesitation frankly opened out his heart to Government as well as to his own people by pointing out our own weaknesses. What does he say? He says:

"I hope that time will never come,"—*referring to civil disobedience*—  
 "indeed, I see signs of a real change of heart everywhere, let us face the fact that it may be necessary for us to have recourse to civil disobedience if all hopes of reconciliation fail. But let us also face the fact that civil disobedience requires a high state of organization, an infinite capacity for sacrifice, and a real desire to subordinate personal and communal interest to the common interest of the nation: and I can see little hope of India ever being ready for civil disobedience until she is prepared to work Mahatma Gandhi's constructive programme to the fullest extent. The end, however, must be kept in view, for freedom must be won."

Now, Sir, this is the position of the Swaraj Party. Mr. Das, as I have pointed out, refers to the possibility of co-operation more in sorrow than in anger. He implies no threat as he frankly faces the fact that we have not arrived at the proper stage of organization to have the capacity for civil disobedience. But when there is no alternative open to us, we must take the road leading to it, however long and weary it may be. Civil disobedience may not come for years, but it has to come one day, and the sooner we begin our preparation the better.

This is all, Sir, that I have to say; and I thank the House, and I thank you, Sir, for the latitude that you have allowed to me. I hope you will permit me to say one word more before I sit down. Sir, never was this House called upon to discharge a duty involving greater responsibility than that laid upon it on this momentous occasion. I say so because my reading of the whole situation as it presents itself to-day convinces me that we have arrived at that critical moment of our political existence when the action taken on the Resolution before the House is bound to make or mar our future history. Let me assure my Honourable friends opposite that the amendment I have moved is the result of the most careful and anxious consideration, that not only I and my Party but practically all the Nationalist Members of this House are capable of, and that I have moved it with the fullest sense of the grave responsibility that rests upon me.

## APPENDIX I

### JOINT STATEMENTS

#### 1. *Hindu-Muslim Conference*<sup>1</sup>

In view of the growing tension between the two communities, Hindu and Mohammedan, over the question of communal representation, the happenings at Multan and the question of the Malkana Rajputs the Punjab Provincial Congress Committee invited some of the All-India leaders to come to the Punjab and bring about a settlement. The leaders were willing to undertake the task but on account of pressing engagements they could not come before the end of March. Meanwhile, the Provincial Congress Committee consulted several gentlemen of both the communities who had been taking rather a prominent part in the controversy with a view to finding out the points in dispute so as to be able to place them before the leaders when they arrived.

Pandit Motilal Nehru arrived in the Punjab on the 18th of March but Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, who was to have accompanied him, could not come at that time owing to illness and so the matter could not be taken in hand immediately. But Panditji stayed about a week on this occasion and interviewed men of all shades of opinion of both the communities and acquainted himself with their views. Meanwhile, Mr. Das and Shrimati Sarojini Naidu also arrived and after consultation among themselves it was thought advisable to call meetings of Hindus and Mohammedans with the idea of holding a joint conference. Mr. Das, accordingly issued invitations to about 70 or 80 Hindu and Sikh gentlemen from all over the Province for purposes of consultation and a meeting was held on the 31st of March at 2 p.m. in the Bradlaugh Hall. Of the gentlemen so invited a large majority included those who were not non-cooperators and who had been taking a leading part in the controversy going on. Nearly 50 gentlemen attended and it was resolved to form a sub-committee of 11 men from among them to draw up a list of grievances from the Hindu point of view and to carry on negotiations with the members of the other community. This Committee was composed almost entirely of non-Congressmen who were considered likely to represent the extreme Hindu point of view.

The Sikh gentlemen present at this meeting expressed their intention to form a separate committee of their own to put forward the Sikh position. This was agreed to and they were asked to form a committee of about 5 and intimate the names later on.

Meanwhile, the Provincial Khilafat Committee had arranged for a similar meeting of Mohammedan gentlemen for the 8th of April from all over the Province. At this meeting Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Hakim Ajmal Khan Sahib, Dr. Ansari, Pandit Motilal Nehru, Mr. C.R. Das and Mrs. Sarojini

<sup>1</sup>The Tribune, 18 April 1923. Statement issued at a conference of Hindu, Muslim and Sikh leaders in Delhi.

Sirdar Jodh Singh<sup>1</sup> by the Sikhs. It is expected that this committee will issue a statement very shortly.

## 2. Congress Leaders' Statement on the Situation in the Punjab<sup>2</sup>

In response to the repeated pressing invitations from leading Congressmen in the province we arrived in the Punjab at different times during the latter half of March and the first week of April. It had been impressed upon us that the communal differences in the Punjab had arrived at a stage which demanded the undivided attention of public men in India and the immediate presence of some of them on the spot. On arrival here we found that the relations between the Hindus and Mussulmans, both educated and uneducated, were so greatly strained that each community as a whole had practically arrayed itself in an armed camp against the other.

### CAUSES OF STRIFE

Since our arrival in the Punjab we have individually and collectively made careful enquiries into the true causes of this unfortunate state of things. The conclusion at which we have arrived is that, while it is true that almost the whole Hindu and Mussulman population of the Punjab is, more or less, affected, the reasons which apply to the so-called educated classes are entirely different from those which apply to the masses, and we feel constrained to say that the latter have to no small extent been exploited by interested persons among the former for their own selfish ends. So far as regards the masses, the real causes of the trouble are, firstly, the memories of Malabar and the Multan riots, secondly, the Shuddhi and the Hindu Sanghatan movements which have in their turn given rise to counter agitation amongst the Mohammedans. These movements, we are sorry to say, are being carried on in spirit of hostility which has been fostered and spread throughout the province and beyond it by the press of both communities. We have tried our best to explore all possible avenues leading to a restoration of good feelings, but have unfortunately not met with a satisfactory measure of success.

We shall first deal with the disruptive elements which affect the two communities generally. Malabar is but a sad memory which is only relevant to our present purpose in so far as the origin of the mischief is traceable to it. No practical steps in that connection are necessary except to impress upon the Press and the people the utter futility of continuing to harp upon the deplorable events associated with that unfortunate part of the country. The

<sup>1</sup>Bhai Jodh Singh; b. 1882; lecturer, Khalsa College, Amritsar, 1905-12; Headmaster, Khalsa High School, Lyallpur; Principal, Guru Nanak College, Gujranwala, 1920-21; took keen interest in the Nanak Sahib affair, 1921; editor, *Khalsa* and *Khalsa Advocate*; member, Punjab Legislative Council, 1923-26, Punjab University Senate, 1926, Syndicate, 1934, Secretary of the committee appointed by the Government to manage Gurdwaras, member of the committee to prepare the Draft Gurdwara Bill, 1924-25; Principal, Khalsa College, Amritsar, 1936-52; nominated to the Punjab Assembly, 1957; Vice-Chancellor, Punjabi University, Patiala, 1962; d. 1981.

<sup>2</sup>*The Bombay Chronicle*, 4 May 1923.

Naidu were present and the Mohammedan gentlemen assembled there appointed a sub-committee similar to that of the Hindus and for a similar object. These two committees were asked to complete their work within the next few days, and the 18th of April was fixed for a joint meeting of the two committees in the presence of the All-India leaders.

On the 13th of April at 2 p.m. a joint meeting took place which was attended by Mr. Das, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Pandit Motilal Nehru, and Mrs. Sarojini Naidu and also some prominent provincial Congress and Khilafat workers. Mr. Das was asked to preside over the deliberations. Unfortunately, the Committee of the Sikhs was not present owing to shortness of notice and their being busy elsewhere. A good deal of discussion ensued on the points submitted and there was exchange of some frank and free talk between the members of the two committees. The meetings went on for three days and on most of the points raised it was found there was substantial agreement on principle, though there were many points of detail over which there was divergence of opinion. The question of communal representation presented the greatest difficulty and was the chief point on which there was difference of opinion in principle and in detail. Finally it was resolved to entrust the whole matter to a smaller body consisting of the 5 All-India leaders above mentioned with 2 members each on behalf of the Hindus, Mohammedans and Sikhs, and the President of the Provincial Congress Committee, Pandit K. Santanam; of the Provincial Khilafat Committee, Maulvi Abdul Qadir; of the Hindu Sabha, Raja Narendra Nath; of the Muslim League, Mian Abdul Aziz;<sup>1</sup> and of the Shiromani Gurdwara Parbandhak Committee, Sirdar Mehtab Singh. This body was entrusted with the task of finding out a solution acceptable to all the parties concerned and present it to the larger body. Lala Durga Das<sup>2</sup> and Mr. Gulshan Rai<sup>3</sup> were selected by the Hindu Committee and Shri Abdul Qadir, Bar-at-Law and Mr. Ghulam Mohiuddin by the Mohammedan Committee and Sirdar Khazan Singh, Bar-at-Law and

<sup>1</sup>Mian Abdul Aziz; belonged to Peshawar; brother of Abdur. Rahman Bai; Bar-at-law; joined Syed Ameer Ali's London Muslim League during his stay in England; took active part in Indian politics, 1912-34; first President, Peshawar Muslim League, 1912; left N.W.F.P. during the First World War, President, Twenty-third session of the All India Muslim League, Howrah, October 1933, resigned in favour of M.A. Jinnah, March 1934; proceeded to Japan to preach Islam where he founded a Muslim association and laid the foundation stone of a mosque; spent the rest of his life preaching Islam in Japan, Singapore and Malaya; author of *The Crescent in the Land of the Rising Sun*.

<sup>2</sup>Rai Bahadur Durga Das; b. 1872; joined Lahore Arya Samaj, 1889 and was its Secretary for some years; became member of the D.A.V. College Managing Committee, Lahore in 1895; advocate; practised at Lahore, 1899-1945; General Secretary, D.A.V. College Management and Trust Society, Lahore, 1900-08 and its President, 1919-30; Fellow, Punjab University, 1910-50; member, University Syndicate, 1918-45; received the title of Rai Bahadur, 1928, Director, Central Board of Punjab National Bank Ltd., Lahore, 1928-32; member, Lahore Municipal Committee, 1931-34; d. 1973.

<sup>3</sup>Gulshan Rai, b. 1885, lawyer; practised at Lahore, 1910-17; Professor of Political Science and History and life member, Sanatan Dharma College, Lahore, 1917-43, Fellow, Punjab University, 1920-40, connected with various boards and committees of the University; member, Unemployment Committee; contributed articles to *Tribune* and *Civil and Military Gazette*; d. 1943.

spokesman, however, expressed the inability of his community to accept any of the above proposals in its entirety but was willing to agree to the removal of the slaughter house from within the Municipal limits, provided the beef shops were maintained as at present. As to any demand of the Mussulmans against the Hindus, he stated, that they had none, and added that the one consolation he could offer to the Hindus was to express his sincere regret for what had happened. An *impasse* was thus reached and negotiations were broken off.

We then took occasion to address a mass meeting of Hindus and Mohammedans at which two of us (Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and Pandit Motilal Nehru) explained at full length what had happened at the inter-communal conference and while advising the Mohammedans to see their way to accept any one of the proposals made by the Hindus, impressed upon the latter the desirability of forgetting the past without insisting upon any tests of future goodwill. We can only hope that the people will now take up the settlement of their differences in their own hands and dispense with their so-called representatives, who, we feel bound to say, did not approach the questions at issue in an unprejudiced and unselfish spirit.

### SHUDDHI AND SANGATHAN

We all with the exception of Hakim Ajmal Khan met Swami Shraddhanand and Kunwar Abdul Wahab Khan at Agra on the 5th of April and had an opportunity of conversing with a number of Malkana Rajputs. It is quite clear to us that the members of both communities are fully entitled to propagate their respective religions among these people and to induce them by peaceful persuasion to confine themselves to the religious practices of one community and give up those of the other. It is also open to the Malkanas to adopt such process of conversion or Shuddhi as they may be advised or be willing to undergo or to refuse to take part in any ceremony whatever. It is obvious that these undoubted rights can easily be exercised by individuals or groups of individuals following one religion without causing any insult, annoyance or injury to the members of other religions. We cannot too strongly condemn the use of force, coercion or undue influence and earnestly appeal to all the parties concerned to carry on only such propaganda as they may feel called upon to undertake by a compelling sense of religious duty and that in a friendly spirit strictly avoiding all that tends to create hostility between the sister communities.

It was reported to us that in certain villages where Malkana Rajputs had undergone Shuddhi in large numbers they had resorted to the very objectionable practice of harassing in various ways isolated men and women who had refused to go through the ceremony. Some cases of alleged cruelty and ill-treatment were mentioned to us while sitting together and other cases of a similar nature were brought to the notice of one of us (Maulana Abul Kalam Azad). We regret we had no time to investigate any one of them on the spot in the presence of the parties concerned. But the fact that such complaints were made by Malkanas who were not well disposed to Shuddhi, shows that there is at least



case with the Multan riots is, however, different as the wounds inflicted are comparatively fresh.

## MULTAN

Three of us (Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Pandit Motilal Nehru and Mrs. Sarojini Naidu) visited Multan on the 10th April and stayed there till the evening of the 12th. All this time was occupied with conversations with Hindu and Mussulman representatives selected by their respective communities at public meetings held for the purpose. These conversations were first held separately with the representatives of each community and then with all of them jointly. At a previous joint meeting of some Hindus and Mohammedans the following six points were laid down for settlement:—

Change of route of certain Tazia processions; the closing of certain beef and Jhatka meat shops; boycott of Mohammedan labour by the Hindus; compensation to be paid by one community to the other; withdrawal of criminal cases pending against the members of both communities; Kucha Bandi.

It was stated that a common understanding was arrived at in respect of the last three points, and that the first three were left over for a subsequent meeting which never came off. The parties were not agreed as to the circumstances under which this attempt at a compromise failed, and we did not consider it necessary to investigate them. At the representative meeting held by us it was agreed that the six points enumerated above were the only points for disposal, but that the whole settlement hinged upon the first point, the others being only of secondary importance. We accordingly took up that point as the first and the main question at the express desire of the parties who conducted us along the route now in use and also that proposed for the future.

One of the objections taken by the Mussulmans to any change whatever was based on religious grounds, but it was overruled by the only competent authority among us (Maulana Abul Kalam Azad) whose ruling was accepted on all hands. It appeared to us that a change of route, while putting Mohammedans to no serious inconvenience, afforded little or no guarantee against the recurrence of the trouble. On this being pointed out to the parties, the Hindu spokesman explained that his side being the more oppressed and aggrieved party was insisting on a change more as a token of future goodwill of the Mohammedans than as an effective remedy for the evil, and with that object in view he suggested the following two alternatives.

The Mohammedans to pay compensation to the Hindus which had been officially estimated at Rs. 2,75,000 less Rs. 25,000 the estimated loss suffered by Mohammedans, or

The closing of the slaughter houses and shops and stalls within the Municipal limits where beef was cooked and sold.

In the event of the inability of the Mohammedans to accept either the proposed change of route or any of the two alternatives suggested, the Hindu spokesman invited them to make some offer to the Hindus which would have the desired effect and also to state if they had any demand to make from the Hindus which, he said, they were ready to entertain. The Mohammedan

spokesman, however, expressed the inability of his community to accept any of the above proposals in its entirety but was willing to agree to the removal of the slaughter house from within the Municipal limits, provided the beef shops were maintained as at present. As to any demand of the Mussulmans against the Hindus, he stated, that they had none, and added that the one consolation he could offer to the Hindus was to express his sincere regret for what had happened. An *impasse* was thus reached and negotiations were broken off.

We then took occasion to address a mass meeting of Hindus and Mohammedans at which two of us (Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and Pandit Motilal Nehru) explained at full length what had happened at the inter-communal conference and while advising the Mohammedans to see their way to accept any one of the proposals made by the Hindus, impressed upon the latter the desirability of forgetting the past without insisting upon any tests of future goodwill. We can only hope that the people will now take up the settlement of their differences in their own hands and dispense with their so-called representatives, who, we feel bound to say, did not approach the questions at issue in an unprejudiced and unselfish spirit.

## SHUDDHI AND SANGATHAN

We all with the exception of Hakim Ajmal Khan met Swami Shraddhanand and Kunwar Abdul Wahab Khan at Agra on the 5th of April and had an opportunity of conversing with a number of Malkana Rajputs. It is quite clear to us that the members of both communities are fully entitled to propagate their respective religions among these people and to induce them by peaceful persuasion to confine themselves to the religious practices of one community and give up those of the other. It is also open to the Malkanas to adopt such process of conversion or Shuddhi as they may be advised or be willing to undergo or to refuse to take part in any ceremony whatever. It is obvious that these undoubted rights can easily be exercised by individuals or groups of individuals following one religion without causing any insult, annoyance or injury to the members of other religions. We cannot too strongly condemn the use of force, coercion or undue influence and earnestly appeal to all the parties concerned to carry on only such propaganda as they may feel called upon to undertake by a compelling sense of religious duty and that in a friendly spirit strictly avoiding all that tends to create hostility between the sister communities.

It was reported to us that in certain villages where Malkana Rajputs had undergone Shuddhi in large numbers they had resorted to the very objectionable practice of harassing in various ways isolated men and women who had refused to go through the ceremony. Some cases of alleged cruelty and ill-treatment were mentioned to us while sitting together and other cases of a similar nature were brought to the notice of one of us (Maulana Abul Kalam Azad). We regret we had no time to investigate any one of them on the spot in the presence of the parties concerned. But the fact that such complaints were made by Malkanas who were not well disposed to Shuddhi, shows that there is at least

case with the Multan riots is, however, different as the wounds inflicted are comparatively fresh.

## MULTAN

Three of us (Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Pandit Motilal Nehru and Mrs. Sarojini Naidu) visited Multan on the 10th April and stayed there till the evening of the 12th. All this time was occupied with conversations with Hindu and Mussulman representatives selected by their respective communities at public meetings held for the purpose. These conversations were first held separately with the representatives of each community and then with all of them jointly. At a previous joint meeting of some Hindus and Mohammedans the following six points were laid down for settlement:—

Change of route of certain Tazia processions; the closing of certain beef and Jhatka meat shops; boycott of Mohammedan labour by the Hindus; compensation to be paid by one community to the other; withdrawal of criminal cases pending against the members of both communities; Kucha Bandi.

It was stated that a common understanding was arrived at in respect of the last three points, and that the first three were left over for a subsequent meeting which never came off. The parties were not agreed as to the circumstances under which this attempt at a compromise failed, and we did not consider it necessary to investigate them. At the representative meeting held by us it was agreed that the six points enumerated above were the only points for disposal, but that the whole settlement hinged upon the first point, the others being only of secondary importance. We accordingly took up that point as the first and the main question at the express desire of the parties who conducted us along the route now in use and also that proposed for the future.

One of the objections taken by the Mussulmans to any change whatever was based on religious grounds, but it was overruled by the only competent authority among us (Maulana Abul Kalam Azad) whose ruling was accepted on all hands. It appeared to us that a change of route, while putting Mohammedans to no serious inconvenience, afforded little or no guarantee against the recurrence of the trouble. On this being pointed out to the parties, the Hindu spokesman explained that his side being the more oppressed and aggrieved party was insisting on a change more as a token of future goodwill of the Mohammedans than as an effective remedy for the evil, and with that object in view he suggested the following two alternatives.

The Mohammedans to pay compensation to the Hindus which had been officially estimated at Rs. 2,75,000 less Rs. 25,000 the estimated loss suffered by Mohammedans, or

The closing of the slaughter houses and shops and stalls within the Municipal limits where beef was cooked and sold.

In the event of the inability of the Mohammedans to accept either the proposed change of route or any of the two alternatives suggested, the Hindu spokesman invited them to make some offer to the Hindus which would have the desired effect and also to state if they had any demand to make from the Hindus which, he said, they were ready to entertain. The Mohammedan

## COMMUNAL REPRESENTATION

We now come to the questions which are agitating the minds of the educated classes in the Punjab.

We were told that according to the Mussulman demand seats in the Councils, in the Municipalities and District Boards, in the University and also public offices should be divided amongst different communities according to their numerical strength and unless that was done there could be no peace in the Punjab. The Hindus and the Sikhs, on the other hand, were against communal representation of any kind. With a view to see whether a *via media* could be found we invited certain Hindus and Mussulmans of this province who represent extreme views on both sides to elect two representative committees. This Committee was subsequently enlarged by the addition of one representative of the Hindu Sabha and another of the Muslim League and the presidents of the Provincial Congress and Khilafat Committees and also of the Shiromani Gurdwara Parbandhak Committee. These Committees met for the purpose and after a good deal of discussion a smaller Committee was elected consisting of ourselves and two representatives from each of the three communities. This representative Committee met on several days, discussed all possible questions with reference to these disputes, but unfortunately could not arrive at any concluded agreement. The various suggestions and counter suggestions made lead us to the belief that had the proposal of dividing the seats in the Council in the proportion of 45, 30 and 25 per cent amongst the Mohammedans, the Hindus and [the] Sikhs respectively been accepted by the Mohammedans the other communities would have agreed to the same proportion in the Municipalities and in the District Boards with separate communal electorates and that it would have been possible to arrive at some arrangement where Hindus and Mohammedans could be assured of alternately representing the University. But the Mohammedans who formed nearly 56 per cent of the population and were allowed only 50 per cent representation under the Lucknow compact did not agree to a further reduction which would have the effect of converting their majority into a minority as against a possible combine of non-Muslim representatives. Communal representation is admittedly an evil from the national point of view but we think that in the existing circumstances and until greater national solidarity is attained the system though wrong in principle should be accepted by all the parties concerned and that the three communities should join hands in pressing upon the Government a demand for a very extensive franchise and for the abolition of official seats on the Council, the Municipal and District Board and in the University. After a satisfactory settlement in respect of communal representation in the elective bodies is reached the three communities should without the help of any legislation to that effect, agree to have a reasonable proportion in the Government and Municipal offices. It is however necessary to point out that this result should be attained gradually by filling up posts in the different departments, keeping in view the proportion agreed upon without superseding present incumbents or applying any such obviously unjust method.

As we have already said these disputes are confined to a very limited number of the educated population who always place their own selfish inter-

considerable apprehension of ill-treatment in their minds. The gentleman who had carried out most of the Shuddhi ceremonies admitted to us that he had heard of one or two cases of this kind but had taken no steps to verify the facts or adopt preventive measures. We take this opportunity to impress upon all the Shuddhi workers the imperative necessity of taking effective steps to see that the Malkanas who do not accept their teachings are not subjected to any hardship at the hands of those who have undergone Shuddhi or of any other person engaged in or about the propaganda.

The Hindu Sangathan is another movement allied to Shuddhi to which no exception can reasonably be taken if it is confined to the purpose which the name signalled, viz., the organization of Hindu society. Indeed both Hindu and Mussulman Sangathans are, in our opinion, eminently desirable to help the growth of the Indian Nation at the present stage of its existence. But such organizations have a way of degenerating into hostile communal associations and we have reason to suspect that the Hindu Sangathan is developing a tendency in that direction. The Mussulmans look upon it as a movement specially designed to harm them and have started a counter movement of a similar nature. There can be no doubt that the carrying on of these movements on wrong lines is calculated to intensify and perpetuate communal differences. We have taken occasion in our public speeches and private conversations with members of both communities to explain the true objects to be aimed at and can only hope that the leaders of both movements who are men of light and leading will see to it that they are strictly confined and directed to the achievement of such reform in each community as is likely to be a source of strength to the other and to help in the onward march of both.

### THE PUNJAB PRESS

A reference to the files of the local newspapers revealed to us the regrettable fact that the highly coloured accounts of happenings in connection with Shuddhi and Sangathan movements given in the press of both communities and the strong language used in commenting upon them, had very largely contributed to inflame communal passions. We accordingly invited the editors of the newspapers published in Lahore to meet us in an informal conference to devise the best means of checking the mischief. We are glad to say that practically the whole Indian Press of Lahore willingly responded to our invitation and the informal conference held by us was converted then and there into a regular meeting of the press representatives which forthwith proceeded to form a Press Association and elect its committee and office-bearers. It was agreed that this Committee would in consultation with the Provincial Congress and Khilafat Committees take the necessary steps to verify all sensational communal news before publishing it and approach the consideration of all communal questions in a dignified and conciliatory tone. We hope that this Committee will fully justify our expectations and one of the most serious causes of communal differences would thereby be removed.

meet the Editors and Managers of Indian newspapers and take such steps with their concurrence as may prevent such mischief and should in particular request them not to publish any cases of communal injustice or oppression before the same have been investigated by the Reconciliation Board.

(Note—Necessary steps in the connection have already been taken.)

That whereas the preservation of cows and the prevention of their slaughter is considered desirable by all communities on economic grounds and whereas there is a large body of Mohammedan opinion in favour of voluntary prevention of cow slaughter in deference to the Hindu feeling in respect thereof, this Committee resolves that no Hindu or Hindus should propose or cause to be proposed any legislation regarding cow killing without the concurrence of the Mohammedan community and further that any dispute or difference in respect of cow slaughter or prevention thereof, should be referred to and decided by the Reconciliation Board.

That the Committee further resolves that any attempt by any one community to boycott any other community socially or economically or in any other way is foolish, unjust and unworthy of both communities and that any dispute or difference arising by reason of such an attempt should also be settled by the said Board whose decision must be accepted by the parties concerned in such dispute or difference.

That the Committee recommends that the three communities in the Punjab should enter into national pact regarding the Council and the Municipal and other local Boards full particulars of which are set out in the schedule which is to be taken as a part of this resolution and it is resolved that any disputes and differences which may arise from non-observance thereof should be settled and adjusted by the said Board.

(Note—As the negotiations were broken up no schedule was prepared).

C.R. Das  
Abul Kalam Azad  
Sarojini Naidu  
Ajmal Khan  
Motilal Nehru

### 3. *Swaraj Party Leaders' Statement*<sup>1</sup>

We regret to say that there is little hope for a compromise now. We have for sometime past been conscious of a change of opinion on the Council question in our favour in the country since the Gaya Congress, but we have always endeavoured to secure a united Congress by making all reasonable concessions to the other party. We met several times during the last few days and tried our best to arrive at a settlement which without any sacrifice of principles on either side, would secure to both an honourable place in the Congress organisation.

<sup>1</sup>The Tribune, 18 September 1923. Joint statement by C.R. Das, Motilal Nehru, Vithalbhai Patel, N.C. Kelkar and Hakim Ajmal Khan.

rests above the interests of the nation as a whole. But in view of the fact that it is impossible to prevent this class of people from exploiting the masses we feel that peace in the Punjab depends in a greater measure on a satisfactory solution of their demands. So far as the bulk of the population is concerned, they are very little troubled by the disputes we have mentioned.

## OTHER MATTERS

As no formal settlement could be arrived at on the question of communal representation the other points raised by the parties in their respective notes of communal grievances were not formally dealt with but certain principles were generally agreed upon in the course of discussion. These were put in the form of resolutions by the president (Mr. C.R. Das) and copies were supplied to the members of the joint committee. We give below the draft resolutions as showing the general trend of opinion in the Punjab and the reasonable frame of mind in which we found all parties concerned on the questions involved.

## DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

That to remove all misunderstandings doubts and suspicions regarding the connection of the Mohammedans with what is called Pan-Islamic activities, this Committee declares that although it is right and natural for Indian Mohammedans to sympathise with Mohammedans in other parts of the world and to take necessary steps to vindicate the rights of the Khilafat, there is no reason for any apprehension that they would join any Mohammedan invader of India and that on the contrary it is the duty of every true Mohammedan to join the Hindus and others in expelling any such invasion.

That this Committee further points out that expression of opinion regarding this matter by individual Hindus or Mussulmans which in any way contradicts the above mentioned declaration should be taken as the outcome of undue and unworthy suspicion and should not be made the foundation of an attack on either community.

That this Committee further resolves that it should be constantly borne in mind by all communities in the Punjab that India is open for any community or communities, but that India is for the Indians and stands for the fusion or federation of all communities.

That whereas each community has the right of converting others to its faith no unfair means should be used and no oppression should be resorted to and where any such case is alleged, it should be investigated by the Punjab Reconciliation Board to be appointed by this Committee and the decision of the said Board should be accepted by the communities concerned.

(Note—The names of some leading gentlemen were noted as members of the Board.)

That inasmuch as the local press has unfortunately contributed to much of the ill-feeling between the different communities the said Board should

There is, however, a feeling in the other party that they cannot agree to any compromise which involves a departure from the Gaya programme as that would necessarily imply the giving up of some essential principle on their part. It is impossible to expect a satisfactory arrangement whatever when no arrangement will meet the wishes of the other party. All that we asked for was to lift the ban to enable such Congressmen as had no religious or other objections to go into the Councils and to contest elections without any opposition or hindrance from the other side. What we want is peace with honour and on terms of perfect equality as two wings of the same Congress, who feel honestly on the Council question, but equally are pledged to the programme of non-violent non-cooperation. This, we are told, is impossible although we don't think it is because we made it perfectly clear to the other side that we put ourselves entirely in the hands of the Congress as to what is to be done or not to be done when we enter into Councils. But even this was not acceptable and we are, therefore, compelled to put our views before the Subjects Committee and in the open Congress and leave the whole question in the hands of delegates who, we expect, will adopt a reasonable view.

#### 4. Statement on Inter-communal Unity<sup>1</sup>

In view of the recent deplorable disturbances we the undersigned Mussal-mans, Hindus and Sikhs hereby declare, that if any individual or group of individuals, belonging to any community commits any act of violence against, or attacks the person, property or honour of women or places of worship (mandir, mosque, church or gurdwara, etc.), of his neighbours or fellow townsmen or helps those who indulge in such misdeeds, he is, from the religious point of view, guilty of a great sin; and that it is the duty of co-religion-ists of such offenders to stand up to resist these miscreants and to protect those who are so attacked. We further appeal to the followers of every religion that they should act, each towards the other, with mutual toleration and regard for the religious ideas of their neighbours and townsmen.

1. Lala Lajpat Rai, Lahore
2. Maulana Kifayatullah<sup>2</sup>, Delhi
3. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya
4. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Calcutta

<sup>1</sup>The Leader, 6 October 1923.

<sup>2</sup>Maulana Kifayatullah Mufti; b. 1872; a prominent Muslim divine; attended the All India Muslim League session, Delhi, 1918; Founder-President, Jamiat ul-Ulema-i-Hind, 1919, remained President till 1942; started the Tabligh movement, Delhi, 1924, took an active part in the Khilafat and Congress movements; member, Congress Working Committee, 1930, arrested in 1930, 1932, gave up politics after independence and became Rector of Aminia Madrasa, a religious school in Delhi; d. 1952.



5. Swami Shraddhanand, Delhi
6. Maulana Shabir Ahmed Usmani<sup>1</sup>
7. Pandit Din Dayal Sharma<sup>2</sup>
8. Hakim Ajmal Khan, Delhi
9. Sjt. C.R. Das, Calcutta
10. Maulana Mohamed Ali
11. Pandit Motilal Nehru
12. Maulana Ahmed Said,<sup>3</sup> Delhi
13. Dr. Satyapal, Lahore
14. Maulana Husain Ahmad,<sup>4</sup> Naib Sheikh-ul-Hind
15. Babu Bhagwan Das, Benares
16. Maulana Mohamed Sajjad,<sup>5</sup> Naib Amir Shariat, Behar
17. Pandit Neki Ram Sharma,<sup>6</sup> Bhuwani
18. Dr. Mukhtar Ahmad Ansari, Delhi
19. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Allahabad

<sup>1</sup>Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani; b. 1885, educated at Deoband, taught at Dar al-ulum, Deoband, 1910-28; Head teacher, Madrasa Fatehpuri, Delhi, for two years, Head teacher, Dar-al-ulum, Dabhel, Surat, for fifteen years; Superintendent, Dar-al-ulum, Deoband, for six years; participated in the khilafat movement; member, Working Committee, Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind, 1922-43; Founder-President, Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Islam, 1945, presided over its conference in Calcutta, October 1945; member, Pakistan Constituent Assembly, 1947-49, d. 1949.

<sup>2</sup>Pandit Din Dayalu Sharma; b. 1863; a great organiser, reformer and orator; started a new era in Hindi journalism; established the Bharat Dharma Maha Mandal, 1887; organised Sanatan Dharma Maha Sammelan; President, All India Sanatan Dharma Sammelan, 1915, Hindu Mahasabha, 1921; edited *Kohinoor*, the first Urdu daily of Lahore; started *Hindu Sunsar* from Delhi; d. 1937.

<sup>3</sup>Maulana Ahmad Saeed, b. 1888 at Delhi; educated at Madrasa Hussania Bazar, Motia Mahal, Delhi; delivered religious lectures; Founder-Secretary, Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind; served as its Secretary for 20 years; participated in the non-cooperation and khilafat movements; jailed, 1921 and 1930; attended All Parties Conference, 1928; President, Bihar Muslim Independent Party Conference, Patna, 1936; attended Azad Muslim Conference, Delhi, 1940; d. 1959.

<sup>4</sup>Maulana Husain Ahmad Madani; b. 1879, Muslim divine, educated at Deoband; disciple of Sheikh-ul-Hind Mahmud-ul-Hasan; arrested in connection with the "Silk Letters" conspiracy and jailed at Malta, 1914-19, after release assumed the leadership of Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind; teacher and head of Deoband School; participated in the khilafat movement and imprisoned, 1922; courted arrest in 1930 and 1932, took part in the Quit India movement, 1942 and imprisoned; d. 1957.

<sup>5</sup>Maulana Mohamed Sajjad; b. 1884; belonged to village Panha, Bihar Sharif, Bihar; educated at Bihar Sharif and Allahabad, one of the founders of Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind and its Secretary, Founder-Secretary, Emarel-e-Sharia, Bihar and Orissa; President, Muslim Independent Party; established *Anwar-al-ulum* at Gaya; promoter of Hindu-Muslim unity; d. 1940.

<sup>6</sup>Pandit Neki Ram Sharma; b. 1887, educated at Snapur and Queen's College, Banaras; arrested along with Asaf Ali in 1918; participated in the non-cooperation and civil disobedience movements and imprisoned, 1921-22, 1930-31, 1932-34; member, A.I.C.C.; took part in the Quit India movement and imprisoned, 1942-44; member, Hindu Mahasabha; worked for the rehabilitation of refugees from Pakistan; d. 1956.

20. Maulana Mohamed Ozair,<sup>1</sup> Deoband
21. B. Purushottam Das Tandon, Allahabad
22. Maulana Azad Sobhani
23. Sjt. Rajendra Prasad, Behar
24. Maulana Syed Sulaiman Nadvi,<sup>2</sup> Azamgarh
25. Pandit K. Santanam, Punjab
26. Maulana Abdul Hafim Saddiq, Delhi
27. Sjt. Konda Venkatappayya, Guntur
28. Maulana Masud Ali Nadvi
29. Sjt. Vallabhbhai Patel, Bombay
30. Pir Ghulam Mujadid Sirhindi,<sup>3</sup> Sind
31. Sjt. C. Rajagopalachariar
32. Sjt. Khwaja Abdul Karim,<sup>4</sup> Dacca
33. Sjt. Gopalakrishnayya<sup>5</sup>
34. Sjt. Abdullah Haroon,<sup>6</sup> Karachi
35. Sjt. Virumal Begraj,<sup>7</sup> Sind
36. Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlew, Amritsar
37. Lala Girdhari Lal, Amritsar

<sup>1</sup>Maulana Mohamed Ozair; belongs to Kaka Khail, Peshawar district, N.W.F.P.; educated at Deoband; interned along with Sheikh-ul-Hind Mahmud-ul-Hasan in Malta; participated in the freedom movement. now resides at Mianganokale, Malakanda Agency in Azad Kabil

<sup>2</sup>Maulana Sayed Sulaiman Nadvi; b. 1884, scholar, writer; educated at Dar-ul-ulum Nadwat-ul-Ulema, Lucknow; follower of Shibli Numani; associated with the Urdu journal, *al-Hilal*, Calcutta; Lecturer, Deccan College, Poona; resigned to manage, *The Darul Musannifin* (The Academy of Authors), Azamgarh, member of Muslim delegation to Europe, 1929 and Arab countries, 1924, 1926; awarded Honorary LL.D. by Aligarh Muslim University, 1940, migrated to Pakistan, 1950, d. 1953.

<sup>3</sup>Pir Ghulam Mujadid, belonged to Matiari, Sind; Muslim alim, follower of Maulana Abdul Bari of Firangi Mahal, Lucknow; took part in the non-cooperation movement; imprisoned along with the Ali Brothers for supporting the resolution adopted at the All India Khilafat Conference, Karachi, July 1921, which forbade Muslims to serve in the Army.

<sup>4</sup>Khwaja Abdul Karim, belonged to the family of Nawab of Dacca; Joint Secretary, Dacca District Congress Committee, member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1923-26.

<sup>5</sup>Duggirala Gopalakrishnayya, b. 1889, educated at Edinburg University; Lecturer, Government Arts College, Rajahmundry, 1917-18; plunged into the national movement, 1919; organised non-violent no-tax campaign in Chirala Perala, 1921; imprisoned, 1921-22, Secretary, A.I.C.C., 1923, and Andhra unit of the Swaraj Party; endearingly called 'Andhra Ratna', d. 1928

<sup>6</sup>Sir Abdullah Haroon, b. [1876], businessman and politician; entered public life in 1913, elected member of Karachi Municipal Corporation in 1913, joined Indian National Congress, 1917; President, Sind Khilafat Committee, 1919, member, Working Committee appointed by the All India Central Khilafat Committee, 1922, member, Bombay Legislative Council, 1923-26, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1930-42, Haj Inquiry Committee, 1929; President, Sind Provincial Muslim League, 1938; d. 1942.

<sup>7</sup>Virumal Begraj, b. 1874; one of the builders of modern Sind, social and political worker, started *Sindh*, a weekly, established a branch of Tilak's Home Rule League at Sukkur; member, Sukkur Municipality for 16 years; President, Sukkur District Congress Committee, worked for the cause of Hindu minority in Sind and became President of the Sind branch of the Hindu Mahasabha, d. 1955.

20. Maulana Mohamed Ozair,<sup>1</sup> Deoband
21. B. Purushottam Das Tandon, Allahabad
22. Maulana Azad Sobhani
23. Sjt. Rajendra Prasad, Behar
24. Maulana Syed Sulaiman Nadvi,<sup>2</sup> Azamgarh
25. Pandit K. Santanam, Punjab
26. Maulana Abdul Halim Saddiq, Delhi
27. Sjt. Konda Venkatappayya, Guntur
28. Maulana Masud Ali Nadvi
29. Sjt. Vallabhbhai Patel, Bombay
30. Pir Ghulam Mujadid Sirhindi,<sup>3</sup> Sind
31. Sjt. C. Rajagopalachariar
32. Sjt. Khwaja Abdul Karim,<sup>4</sup> Dacca
33. Sjt. Gopalakrishnayya<sup>5</sup>
34. Sjt. Abdullah Haroon,<sup>6</sup> Karachi
35. Sjt. Virumal Begraj,<sup>7</sup> Sind
36. Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlew, Amritsar
37. Lala Girdhari Lal, Amritsar

<sup>1</sup>Maulana Mohamed Ozair; belongs to Kaka Khail, Peshawar District, N.W.F.P.; educated at Deoband; interned along with Sheikh-ul-Hind Mahmud-ul-Hasan in Malta; participated in the freedom movement, now resides at Mianganokale, Malakanda Agency in And Kabail

<sup>2</sup>Maulana Sayed Sulaiman Nadvi; b. 1884, scholar, writer; educated at Dar-ul-ulum Nadwat-ul-Ulema, Lucknow, follower of Shibli Numani; associated with the Urdu journal, *al-Hilal*, Calcutta, Lecturer, Deccan College, Poona; resigned to manage, *The Darul Musannifin* (The Academy of Authors), Azamgarh, member of Muslim delegation to Europe, 1920 and Arab countries, 1924, 1926, awarded Honorary LL.D. by Aligarh Muslim University, 1940, migrated to Pakistan, 1950, d. 1953.

<sup>3</sup>Pir Ghulam Mujadid; belonged to Matiari, Sind; Muslim alim; follower of Maulana Abdul Bari of Firangi Mahal, Lucknow; took part in the non-cooperation movement; imprisoned along with the Ali Brothers for supporting the resolution adopted at the All India Khilafat Conference, Karachi, July 1921, which forbade Muslims to serve in the Army

<sup>4</sup>Khwaja Abdul Karim; belonged to the family of Nawab of Dacca; Joint Secretary, Dacca District Congress Committee, member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1923-26.

<sup>5</sup>Duggirala Gopalakrishnayya; b. 1889, educated at Edinburg University; Lecturer, Government Aris College, Rajahmundry, 1917-18; plunged into the national movement, 1919, organised non-violent no tax campaign in Chitala Perala, 1921; imprisoned, 1921-22, Secretary, A.I.C.C., 1923, and Andhra unit of the Swaraj Party, endearingly called 'Andhra Ratna'; d. 1928

<sup>6</sup>Sir Abdullah Haroon, b. [1876], businessman and politician; entered public life in 1913, elected member of Karachi Municipal Corporation in 1913; joined Indian National Congress, 1917; President, Sind Khilafat Committee, 1919; member, Working Committee appointed by the All India Central Khilafat Committee, 1922; member, Bombay Legislative Council, 1923-26, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1930-42, Haj Inquiry Committee, 1929, President, Sind Provincial Muslim League, 1938; d. 1942.

<sup>7</sup>Virumal Begraj, b. 1874, one of the builders of modern Sind; social and political worker, started *Sindhi*, a weekly, established a branch of Tilak's Home Rule League at Sukkur, member, Sukkur Municipality for 16 years, President, Sukkur District Congress Committee, worked for the cause of Hindu minority in Sind and became President of the Sind branch of the Hindu Mahasabha; d. 1955.

71. Sjt. G.B. Deshpande, Bombay
72. Maulana Umar Daraz Beg,<sup>1</sup> Moradabad
73. Sjt. Gauri Shankar Misra<sup>2</sup>
74. Maulana Abdul Bari, Patna
75. Sjt. S.M. Paranjpe, Poona
76. Maulana Abdul Arif
77. Pandit Harkaran Nath Misra,<sup>3</sup> Lucknow
78. Hahibur Rahman,<sup>4</sup> Ludhiana
79. Sjt. Jamnadas Mehta, Bombay
80. Syed Barjees, Ferozepore
81. B. Shiv Prasad Gupta, Benares
82. Syed Fazlur Rahman,<sup>5</sup> Patna
83. Sjt. Revashankar Jagjivan,<sup>6</sup> Bombay
84. Mohamed Taqi,<sup>7</sup> Delhi

<sup>1</sup>Maulana Umar Daraz Beg; b. 1878 at Moradabad; educated at Dar-ul-ulum, Deoband; political and social worker; member, Khilafat Committee; was Office Secretary, Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind; Editor and Proprietor, *Jiddat* daily, *Jiddat* weekly, *Ulfat* weekly and *Harmann* monthly; was President of District Peace Committee, now its patron; member of many religious institutions.

<sup>2</sup>Gauri Shankar Misra; b. 1888 at Gorakhpur; educated at Hindu College, Varanasi and Allahabad University; lawyer; joined as Motilal Nehru's junior in 1916; left practice to join the non-cooperation movement, imprisoned, 1921; member, Hindu Mahasabha, 1930-34; Chairman, Zilla Parishad, Gorakhpur, 1952; d. 1955.

<sup>3</sup>Harkaran Nath Misra; b. 1890, a prominent Congressman of Lucknow and a leading member of the Awadh Bar; participated in the non-cooperation movement; attended Gaya Congress session, 1922; member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1923-26; took part in anti-Simon agitation, 1928; d. 1968.

<sup>4</sup>Maulana Hahibur Rahman; b. 1892 at Ludhiana; educated at Ludhiana, Jullundur, Amritsar and Deoband; one of the founders of Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind; helped found an Urdu weekly at Ludhiana, *Anars*, 1924; President, Ahrar Party, 1931; participated in the Congress movements and imprisoned; attended Azad Muslim Conference, Delhi, 1940; d. 1956.

<sup>5</sup>Syed Fazlur Rahman; Congressman from Bihar; educated at Patna Science College, expelled from the College, 1916; *mukhtar* by profession; journalist; participated in the non-cooperation movement, 1921; member, A.I.C.C., 1923, Bihar Legislative Council, 1957-63; d. 1977.

<sup>6</sup>Seth Reva Shanker Jagjivan Jhaveri; b. [1857]; brother of Dr. Pranjiwan Mehta and life-long friend of Gandhiji; jeweller and Congressman; working treasurer of the Congress for many years; d. 1930.

<sup>7</sup>Muhammad Taqi; b. 1887 in Delhi; educated at Punjab School and St. Stephen's College, Delhi, Law College, Lahore; started practice as *mukhtar* in Delhi, 1912; pleader, 1915; vakil, Lahore High Court, 1919, advocate, 1926; senior advocate, Federal Court of India, 1938, participated in the national movement, 1919-24; President, Quami Panchayat, Delhi, and Secretary, National School, Delhi, established during the non-cooperation movement; imprisoned, 1921-22; member, Guru Ka Bagh Congress Inquiry Committee, 1922; President, Provincial Election Tribunal; Secretary, Khilafat and Congress Committees, Delhi; awarded Honorary Ph. D. by Delhi University, 1961; deeply interested in metaphysics; d. 1962.

53. Abadi Banu (Bi Amman)<sup>1</sup>
54. Amjadi (Begum Mohamed Ali)<sup>2</sup>
55. Shrimati Sarojini Naidu, Bombay
56. Mr. A.S. Sherwani, Aligarh
57. Sjt. Choithram P. Gidwani, Karachi
58. Maulana Mazharuddin,<sup>3</sup> Delhi
59. Pandit Dina Nath,<sup>4</sup> Amritsar
60. Sjt. H.A.S. Khatri,<sup>5</sup> Bombay
61. Sjt. George Joseph, Ahmedabad
62. Sjt. G.M. Bhurgri, Sind
63. Sjt. N.C. Kelkar, Poona
64. Sjt. Umar Sohkhani, Bombay
65. Professor Ruchi Ram Sahni, Lahore
66. Mr. Yakub Hasan<sup>6</sup>
67. Sjt. A.T. Gidwani, Ahmedabad
68. Sjt. Husseinbhoi Abdulbhoi Lalji,<sup>7</sup> Bombay
69. Sjt. A. Rangaswami Aiyangar
70. Mr. M.A. Aziz Ansari,<sup>8</sup> Delhi

<sup>1</sup>Abadi Bano Begum; b. [1843]; mother of the Ali Brothers; nationalist; was widowed at 27. was pious and deeply religious; entered public life during the khilafat movement; championed the cause of Hindu-Muslim unity and relaxation of purdah system among Muslim women. was popularly known as Bi Amman (The Mother); d. 1924.

<sup>2</sup>Amjadi; b. 1878, active in the campaign to secure the release of the Ali Brothers; associated with Women's Khilafat Committee, d. 1931.

<sup>3</sup>Maulana Mazharuddin, b. [1887]; belonged to Sherkot, Bijnore district; educated at Deoband; taught at Deoband and later at Kanpur; journalist, was on the staff of *al-Hilal* and *Jamhur*; Editor, *Madina*; started a weekly, *Dastur*, 1919, *Alaman*, 1921, *Wahdat*, 1928, President, Bijnore Khilafat Committee; member, U.P. Provincial Muslim League; one of the founders of Jamia-ul-Ulema-i-Hind, Kanpur and its General Secretary; attended Palestine Conference, Cairo, 1938, as a representative of All India Muslim League; d. 1939.

<sup>4</sup>Pandit Dina Nath, belonged to Amritsar; Congressman; Editor, *Waqt*; published violent cartoons; participated in the Rowlatt Bill agitation; arrested, April 1919, one of the accused in the Amritsar Leaders' case, sentenced to transportation for life (later reduced to one year's imprisonment).

<sup>5</sup>Ahmed Haji Siddiq Khatri; b. 1888; educated at Hashmia High School, Bombay; cloth merchant; participated in the swadeshi and non-cooperation movements; Secretary, All India Central Khilafat Committee, 1922-29, member, Greater Bombay Municipal Corporation, 1922-26; d. 1943.

<sup>6</sup>Seth Yakub Hasan; b. 1875, educated at Aligarh; began his commercial career at Bangalore in 1893 and then settled at Madras in 1901; visited Europe in 1912 and 1919 as a delegate of the Muslim League and the Khilafat Committee; member, Madras Legislative Council, 1916-20, 1930-36; elected to the Madras Legislative Assembly in 1937, Minister for Public Works, 1937-39, d. 1940.

<sup>7</sup>Husseinbhoi Abdulbhoi Lalji; b. 1886, Bombay businessman; member, Bombay Legislative Council, 1926-30, President, Indian Merchants' Chamber, 1930, Federation of Indian Merchants' Chamber, Delhi, 1935, member, Bombay Municipal Corporation for 26 years, Mayor of Bombay, 1931; member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1935-46; President, All Parties Shia Conference, 1945; d. 1971.

<sup>8</sup>M.A. Aziz Ansari; b. 1889, cousin of M.A. Ansari, educated at Aligarh; contemporary of Abdur Rahman Siddiqi and Khaliquzzaman; member of the Indian Medical Mission to Turkey, participated in the khilafat movement, jailed, 1921; member, Nationalist Muslim Party; d. 1985.

96. Sjt. Osman Sobhani,<sup>1</sup> Bombay
97. Pandit Dev Ratan Sharma,<sup>2</sup> Dehra Dun
98. B. Sunder Singh,<sup>3</sup> Delhi
99. Lala Kewal Krishan,<sup>4</sup> Multan
100. Sjt. Abdul Majid Khwaja

### 5. Letter to the Elected Members<sup>5</sup>

The elections to the various legislatures in the country have now been completed and it is time to explore avenues for a common understanding among all Nationalist members as to the general principles and policy to be followed by them. The Swarajist members are bound by the terms of their undertaking to follow the instructions issued by the General Council of the Swarajya Party and a meeting of that Council has been called at Cocanada during the Congress week to settle the line of action to be adopted by the party and also to formulate a demand on behalf of India to be presented to the British Government. It is expected that all Nationalist members of the legislatures other than Swarajists will join the latter in that demand and also in other matters so far as they are found to be in conformity with their own views. It is highly desirable that all elected members of the Assembly and as many elected members of the provincial Councils as possible should meet at some central place on the earliest convenient date after the meeting of the General Council of the Swarajya Party to consider the demand and the pro-

<sup>1</sup>Osman Sobhani; b. 1895 at Bombay; educated at Bombay; industrialist, Congressman; Honorary Secretary, Bombay P.C.C., 1922-24; member, A.I.C.C., 1922-23; Managing Director, *Bombay Chronicle*; Financial Secretary, All India Central Khilafat Committee, 1924-25; President, Bombay P.C.C., 1930; Director, Khilafat Press, member, Bombay Municipal Corporation, 1937-38; Chairman, Board of Trustees, Anjuman-e-Islam, 1936-38; President, Cutchi Memon Jamiat, Bombay, 1940-44; Joint Secretary to the Government of Hyderabad, 1944-50; member, Rajya Sabha, 1952-54; d. 1959.

<sup>2</sup>Pandit Dev Rattan Sharma; gave up studies at medical college, Lahore, to devote his life in the service of the Hindu community; member, Punjab Hindu Sabha; worked for alleviating the distress of the Hindus of Bhawalpur State; later shifted to Dehra Dun; Founder-Secretary, All India Hindu Mahasabha; d. 1931.

<sup>3</sup>Sardar Sunder Singh; b. 1879; belonged to Noon Miani, Khushab tahsil, Shahpur district, West Punjab, came to Delhi in 1898; Congress worker; resigned from the police service, 1921; took part in the non-cooperation movement, 1921 and imprisoned for one year; owned a tailor shop at Nai Sarak in Delhi; d. 1952.

<sup>4</sup>Lala Kewal Krishan; belonged to Multan; educated at Multan and Lahore; pleader; President, Multan District Congress Committee; participated in the Congress movement; Municipal Commissioner, Multan, 1921-47; member, A.I.C.C., 1923, jailed, 1930-31; Executive Officer and Vice-President, Multan Municipality; Liaison Officer for recovery of women abducted by the Muslims in 1947; Executive Officer, Ludhiana Municipality for many years, d. 1956.

<sup>5</sup>*The Leader*, 26 December 1923. The letter was sent over the signatures of C.R. Das, President, and Motilal Nehru, General Secretary, All India Swaraj Party to all elected members of the Indian Legislative Assembly and Provincial Councils.

85. Shri Mauli Chandra Sharma,<sup>1</sup> Jhajjar
86. Giani Sher Singh,<sup>2</sup> Amritsar
87. Pandit Kapildeva Malaviya<sup>3</sup>
88. S. Teja Singh Samundri,<sup>4</sup> Amritsar
89. Sjt. Manulal V. Kothari, Ahmedabad
90. S. Sunder Singh Lyallpuri,<sup>5</sup> Amritsar
91. Sjt. V.A. Desai,<sup>6</sup> Bombay
92. S. Hari Singh,<sup>7</sup> Jullundur
93. L. Govardhan Dass, Lahore
94. Maulana Mohamed Naim,<sup>8</sup> Ludhiana
95. Babu Ajit Prasad Jain,<sup>9</sup> Lucknow

<sup>1</sup>Mauli Chandra Sharma; b. 1900 at Jhajjar; educated at Lahore and Delhi; left studies to participate in the non-cooperation movement; Editor, *Calcutta Samachar*; Secretary, Chamber of Princes, 1932-37, worked in the Indian States in various capacities, 1934-43, member, Central Committee of All India Praja Mandal; General Secretary, Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, 1944-48, and its Vice-President, 1948-75; General Secretary, Jan Sangh, 1951, and its President, 1953, resigned from Jan Sangh in 1954 and joined Congress; Trustee, Bhartiya Jnanpith; Founder-Director, *Samachar Bharati*; Founder-member and Chairman, Lal Bahadur Shastri Sanskrit Vidyapith; d. 1979.

<sup>2</sup>Giani Sher Singh; belonged to village Thakriwala, Sangrur district, Punjab; educated at village Bhalan, Sangrur district; turned blind at the age of 6; belonged to a group in the S.G.P.C. opposed to Master Tara Singh; a powerful orator; Editor, *Khalsa Sewak*, a Punjabi weekly.

<sup>3</sup>Kapildeva Malaviya; b. 1894; educated at Allahabad; lawyer; joined Theosophical Society and participated in the Home Rule movement, contributed articles to *Marjada*, *Abhyudaya*, participated in the agitation against Rowlatt Bills and the non-cooperation movement; imprisoned, 1921; resigned from Congress, 1924; member, Kakori Conspiracy Case Defence Committee; Chairman, Allahabad Municipal Board, 1925; d. 1944.

<sup>4</sup>Sardar Teja Singh Samundri; b. 1881; Akali leader; joined the Indian Army, 1899, left it after four years; one of the founders of *Akali*; life member, S.G.P.C.; participated in the Guru Ka Bagh Morcha, 1922; member, Punjab P.C.C.; elected member of the A.I.C.C. and Vice-President of the Shiromani Akali Dal in 1923; imprisoned, 1923-26; died in jail, 1926.

<sup>5</sup>Master Sunder Singh; b. 1885 in village Bahoru, Amritsar district; educated at Khalsa College, Amritsar; one of the founders and teacher, Khalsa High School, Lyallpur; one of the founders of *Akali*, a daily; member, A.I.C.C.; d. 1969.

<sup>6</sup>V.A. Desai, lawyer, participated in the non-cooperation movement; member, Bombay P.C.C. and A.I.C.C., 1922, Vice-President, Byculla District Congress Committee; appeared before Civil Disobedience Inquiry Committee, Bombay, July 1922, elected to the Bombay Municipal Corporation in 1923.

<sup>7</sup>Hari Singh, b. 1884; belonged to Jullundur; General Secretary, S.G.P.C.; President, Jullundur City Congress Committee; took part in Guru Ka Bagh and Jatio Morchas and imprisoned; started an Urdu magazine, *Jwan Shakti*, 1953; d. 1966.

<sup>8</sup>Maulana Mohamed Naim; b. 1889 at Ludhiana; descendant of Maulana Abdul Qadir of Ludhiana who along with his four sons fought against the British in 1857; educated at Amritsar and Dar-ul-ulum, Deoband, participated in the national movement and imprisoned in 1921, 1930 and 1940, President, Ludhiana District Congress Committee, 1930-47, member, Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind; President, Punjab branch of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind; had to leave India for Pakistan under unsavoury circumstances, September 1947; a powerful speaker and organiser; taught Quran at Masjid Mufti Mohamed Naim, Faisalabad (formerly Lyallpur); d. 1978.

<sup>9</sup>Ajit Prasad Jain; b. 1902; educated at Lucknow University; participated in the civil disobedience movement, 1930; member, U.P. Legislative Assembly, 1937-48; Parliamentary Secretary, U.P., 1937-39; member, Constituent Assembly, 1946-50; Minister for Relief and Rehabilitation, 1950-54, Minister for Food and Agriculture, 1954-59, Government of India; member, A.I.C.C. for many years; Governor of Kerala, 1965-66; d. 1977.

and are indebted to his courtesy for the opportunity we have had of seeing an advance copy of the statement he has issued to the press. The views expressed by him in the course of the conversations and those embodied in the press statement have all been considered by us with care and attention due to his great personality, but with all the reverence we entertain for him and his opinions we remain unconvinced by his reasoning.

### SOUNDNESS OF THE SWARAJIST POSITION

We regret we have not been able to convince Mahatma Gandhi of the soundness of the Swarajist position regarding Council-entry. We fail to understand how such entry can be regarded as inconsistent with the doctrine of non-cooperation resolution of the Nagpur Congress. But if non-cooperation is more a matter of mental attitude than of the application of a living principle to the existing facts of our national life with special reference to the varying attitude of the bureaucratic Government which rules that life, we conceive it to be our duty to sacrifice even non-cooperation to serve the real interest of the country. In our view this includes self-reliance in all activities which makes healthy growth of the nation and resistance to the bureaucracy as it impedes our progress towards Swaraj. We are, however, anxious to end this fruitless verbal discussion making it clear, however, that Council-entry is, and can be, thoroughly consistent with the principle of non-cooperation as we understand that principle to be.

### OBSTRUCTION NOT IN PARLIAMENTARY SENSE

We desire further to make it clear that we have not used in our programme the word obstruction in the technical sense of English parliamentary history. Obstruction in that sense is impossible in subordinates and limited legislative bodies such as the Legislative Assembly and the Provincial Legislatures under the Reforms Act undoubtedly are. Possibly another word should have been found to convey our meaning. We may state, however, that our position is really not so much of obstruction in the parliamentary sense as that of resistance to the obstruction placed in our path to Swaraj by the bureaucratic Government. It is this resistance which we meant to imply when we used the word obstruction. This was clearly indicated in the way we defined and described non-cooperation in the preamble to the constitution of the Swaraj Party. It is the spirit of such resistance which we desire to strengthen and it is the removal of such bureaucratic obstruction which we feel we must emphasise. This is the policy which we have hitherto followed in the legislative bodies and it is this policy which must in future be more and more effectively directed to the varying needs and problems of our national life.

Here again we are anxious to end all verbal discussion as to whether this can be aptly described as a policy of uniform continuous and consistent obstruction. We are content to detail our policy and then leave it to our friends to give it a more appropriate name should they so desire.



gramme formulated by the latter at Cocanada and settle lines of joint action as far as practicable. All Nationalist members of the Legislative Assembly and of the provincial Councils are therefore cordially invited to meet the Swarajist members at Allahabad on the 5th January, 1924. As it is unlikely that all elected members of the provincial Councils will be able to attend this meeting it is suggested that such representatives of these members as can attend may be selected by election or otherwise, regard being had to the representation of all shades of opinion among Nationalists. It will of course be open to members not so selected who desire to attend the meeting on their own account to do so as the larger the attendance the weightier will be the settlement arrived at. Having regard to the great importance of this meeting it is earnestly requested that all members of the Legislative Assembly from every province will make a point of attending. It is essential that India's demand should be strongly supported and placed in the hands of the Government as early in January as possible.

The agenda of business before the meeting will be as follows:—

A—To consider the resolutions passed by the General Council of the Swarajya Party at Cocanada and settle lines of joint action by the largest possible number of elected members to such extent as may be practicable.

B—To form a party consisting of Swarajists and such other members as may agree on such lines of joint action.

C—To frame rules to be observed by the members of the party so formed.

Pandit Shamlal Nehru, M.L.A., has been put in charge of the arrangements for the meeting and the accommodation of members. Kindly intimate your acceptance of this invitation and your requirements to him at No. 1 Prayag Street, Allahabad

#### 6. Telegram to Mahatma Gandhi<sup>1</sup>

Delhi

5.2.24

Mahatma Gandhi  
Sasoon Hospital Poona

May the Gods preserve you.

Das Nehru

#### 7. Statement on Council-entry by C.R. Das and Motilal Nehru<sup>2</sup>

We are obliged to Mahatma Gandhi for the trouble he has taken to discuss with us the various points involved in the question of Council-entry

<sup>1</sup>Gandhi Papers.

<sup>2</sup>AICC Papers.

(6) Our policy outside the legislative bodies should be as follows:—

In the first place we should give our wholehearted support to the constructive programme of Mahatma Gandhi and work that programme unitedly through the Congress organisation. We are decidedly of opinion that our Council work must necessarily lose much of its strength without the backing of the outside constructive work, for it is not inside but outside the legislatures that we must look for that sanction without which the effective carrying out of our Council policy is impossible. Indeed, in the matter of the constructive work the mutual support of inside and outside activity must, in our opinion, give strength to the very sanction upon which we rely. In this connection we unhesitatingly accept the suggestion of Mahatma Gandhi regarding civil disobedience. We can assure him that the moment we find that it is impossible to meet the selfish obstinacy of the bureaucracy without civil disobedience we will retire from the legislative bodies and help him to prepare the country for such civil disobedience if by that time the country has not already become prepared and we will then unreservedly place ourselves under his guidance and work through the Congress organisation under his banner in order that we may unitedly work out a systematic programme of civil disobedience.

In the second place we must supplement the work of the Congress by helping labour and peasant organisations throughout the country. The problem of labour is always a difficult problem to solve in every country but in India the difficulties are greater. On the one hand we must find out a way of organisation by which we can prevent exploitation of labour by capitalists or by landlords but on the other hand we must be on our guard to see that these very organisations may not themselves be the source of oppression by nursing extravagant and unreasonable demands. Labour undoubtedly requires protection, but so [do] industrial enterprises. Our organisation must protect both from exploitation and the Trade Union Congress must be so organised as to be able to serve this useful purpose. We hold that in the long run the real interests of both and the country at large are identical.

We feel happy that we have had this opportunity of putting our views before the country side by side with Mahatma Gandhi's opinion for we feel certain that the perusal will make it obvious that notwithstanding some differences of view there is an abiding and fundamental unity amongst both parties of the Indian National Congress. Both parties feel the necessity of working the constructive programme whether within or outside the legislative bodies. In this direction, we feel confident, lies the germ of fruitful alliance between Mahatma Gandhi and the Swaraj Party. Our joint effort in the same or different directions will furnish a fitting answer to the bureaucracy un-  
willing to recognise the rights and liberty of the Indian people and we emphatically assert that in our determination to work with the same object in the same or different spheres is expressed the determination of the Indian Nation to bring [the] struggle for Swaraj to a successful issue.

## FUTURE PROGRAMME

*In the light of this principle and policy we would here state [our] future programme of action within and outside the legislative bodies.*

Within the legislative bodies we must continue (1) to throw out budgets unless and until the system of government is altered in recognition of our rights or as a matter of settlement between parliament and the people of this country. In justification of this step all that we need point out are a few salient facts connected with the budget in the central government which are more or less true of provincial budgets also. Out of a total of Rs. 131/- crores (excluding railways) only Rs. 26 crores are votable. Further, out of the non-votable amount as much as Rs. 67 crores i.e. more than half the amount of the budget, are for military expenditure. It is thus clear that the people of this country have a right to vote only on less than 1/7 of the total amount of the budget and even the exercise of this limited right is subject to the power of restoration in the Governor-General. It is, therefore, clear that the people have neither any voice in the framing of the budget nor any control over those who frame it. They have no power either over the raising of revenue or its expenditure. On what principle then, may we ask, is it our duty to pass such a budget and take the responsibility of being a party to it. We have no doubt of the support of many self-respecting men in the country in holding, as we do, that it is our clear duty to throw out such budgets in all legislative bodies unless and until this vicious system is changed.

(2) To throw out all proposals for legislative enactments by which the bureaucracy proposes to consolidate its power. It is conceivable that some good may identically result from a few of such measures, but we are clearly of opinion that in the larger interests of the country it is better to temporarily sacrifice such little benefits rather than add an iota to the powers of the bureaucracy which are already irresistible.

(3) To introduce all resolutions, measures and Bills which are necessary for the healthy growth of our national life and the consequent displacement of the bureaucracy. We gratefully accept the suggestion made by Mahatma Gandhi in his statement and we think that the resolutions mentioned by him in support of the constructive programme of the Congress should certainly be accepted by the Swaraj Party. The principle of self-reliance to the bureaucratic obstruction upon which we have hitherto acted calls for their adoption and if the constructive work of the Congress comes within the principle of non-cooperation no less do these resolutions although they represent the constructive activity within the legislative bodies.

(4) To follow a definite economic policy based on the same principle to prevent the drain of public wealth from India by checking all activities leading to exploitation.

(5) To make this policy effective we should take and occupy every place which is open to the members of the central and provincial legislatures by election. In our opinion we should not only fill elective posts but serve on every committee when it is possible. We invite the attention of the members of our party to this important question and we call upon them to decide this matter as soon as possible.

And whereas it is desirable to re-unite these parties for the purpose of furthering the common cause;

And whereas a policy of repression has been commenced in Bengal by the local Government, with the sanction of the Governor-General;

And whereas, in the opinion of the undersigned, the repression is aimed in reality not at any party of violence but at the Swarajya Party in Bengal and, therefore, at constitutional and orderly activity;

And whereas, therefore, it has become a matter of immediate necessity to invite and secure the cooperation of all parties for putting forth the united strength of the nation against the policy of repression, we, the undersigned, strongly recommend the following for adoption by all parties, and eventually by the Congress at Belgaum:—

The Congress should suspend the programme of non-cooperation as the national programme, except in so far as it relates to the refusal to use or wear cloth made out of India.

The Congress should further resolve that different classes of work of the Congress may be done as may be found necessary by different sections within the Congress and should resolve that the spread of hand-spinning, hand-weaving and all the antecedent processes and the spread of hand-spun and hand-woven *khaddar* and the promotion of unity between different communities, specially between Hindus and Mahomedans, and the removal of untouchability by the Hindus from amongst them, should be carried on by all sections within the Congress, and the work in connection with the central and provincial Legislatures should be carried on by the Swarajya Party on behalf of the Congress and as an integral part of the Congress organisation, and for such work the Swarajya Party should make its own rules and raise and administer its own funds.

Inasmuch as experience has shown that without universal spinning India cannot become self-supporting regarding her clothing requirements, and inasmuch as hand-spinning is the best and the most tangible method of establishing a visible and substantial bond between the masses and Congressmen and women, and in order to popularise hand-spinning and its product *khaddar*, the Congress should repeal article 7 of the Congress constitution and should substitute the following therefor:—

No one shall be a member of any Congress committee or organisation who is not of the age of 18 and who does not wear hand-spun and hand-woven *khaddar* at political and Congress functions or while engaged in Congress business and does not make a contribution of 2,000 yards of evenly-spun yarn per month of his or her own spinning, or in case of illness, unwillingness or any such cause, a like quantity of even-yarn spun by any other person.

8. *Invitation for a Round Table Conference*<sup>1</sup>

15.9.1924

The undersigned, belonging to the various organisations working for Swaraj, invite each such organisation to elect delegates to meet in the third week of November, 1924, at Bombay in a Round Table Conference to consider the laying down of the basis of a Constitution which shall establish Swaraj in India. The delegates will carry back to their organisation the agreed-on draft and each organisation will consider it and report thereon, after which the Conference will reassemble for such further action as may be necessary.

C.R. Das  
 Motilal Nehru  
 V.J. Patel  
 T. Rangachariar  
 Purshotamdas Thakurdas  
 G.A. Natesan  
 Jamnadas Dwarkadas  
 M.A. Jinnah  
 M. Ramachandra Rao  
 H.S. Gour  
 N.C. Kelkar  
 M.M. Malaviya  
 P.S. Sivaswamy Aiyer  
 Tej Bahadur Sapru  
 V.S. Srinivasa Sastri  
 C.Y. Chintamani  
 Sarojini Naidu  
 Annie Besant

9. *Agreement between Mahatma Gandhi, Motilal Nehru and C.R. Das*<sup>2</sup>

Whereas, although Swaraj is the goal of all the parties in India the country is divided into different groups seemingly working in opposite directions, and whereas such antagonistic activity retards the progress of the nation towards Swarajya;

And whereas it is desirable to bring, so far as possible, all such parties within the Congress and on a common platform, and whereas the Congress itself is divided into two opposing sections, resulting in harm to the country's cause;

<sup>1</sup> *Annie Besant Papers.*<sup>2</sup> *The Leader*, 8 November 1924.

consideration by representative Hindus and Musalmans and affords a clear guidance to both communities as to the duty each owes to the other. In the last clause of the resolution the Hindu members of the Conference call upon their co-religionists to refrain from playing music in front of mosques in such a way as to cause any disturbance to Mubamedans at the times of their congregational prayers.

The Hindus of Nagpur felt themselves compelled by their religious obligations to limit their offer of stopping music to five mosques only and that at the time of only two out of five daily congregational prayers. Various reasons more or less of a local character were assigned for this limitation but in view of the unconditional offer of the Musalmans we thought it unnecessary to enquire further into the matter. We therefore express no opinion as to the soundness or otherwise of these reasons. It is however obvious that no discrimination can be made between one mosque or another or between one prayer and another in regard to playing of music.

We hope and trust that in the absence of any question of custom the special case of Nagpur will not only be not treated as a precedent for such discrimination in other parts of India but that the Nagpur Hindus themselves will do away with it in course of time. We have reason to believe that the friendly relations which have now been restored will in due course acquire sufficient strength to render all distinction and discrimination unnecessary. We note with pleasure that the Musalmans declared their full adherence to their offer after they came to know of the terms of the Hindu undertaking and that Dr. Moonje as President of the public meeting addressed by us assured the Musalmans on behalf of the Hindus of Nagpur that the brotherly feelings of the former would be fully reciprocated by the latter.

We congratulate both parties and also the Hindus and Musalmans of India in general at the happy settlement arrived at.

Motilal Nehru  
A.K. Azad  
13 Jan. 1925

#### 11. Views on failure to achieve Hindu-Muslim Accord<sup>1</sup>

It was decided at a meeting of the sub-committee appointed by the committee of the All Parties Conference to adjourn the proceedings *sine die* with the proviso that a meeting shall be called on a requisition from the majority of the members of the sub-committee. We were also required and authorised by the meeting to give a resume of the position as it stands today. The meeting was attended by very few members—14 out of 53. They were Maulana Mohamed Ali, Maulana Shaukat Ali, Swami Shraddhanand, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru,

<sup>1</sup>The Leader, 4 March 1925. Statement issued by Mahatma Gandhi and Motilal Nehru.

*10. Statement by Motilal Nehru and Abul Kalam Azad on the Hindu-Muslim dispute at Nagpur, 13 January 1925<sup>1</sup>*

In October last leading Hindus and Musalmans of Nagpur agreed to be bound by our decision on the question whether there was any and if so what custom prevalent in the city of Nagpur from of old relating to the playing of processional music in front or in the vicinity of mosques at all or any specified times of the day and night. This reference involved the taking of evidence for which we were then unable to spare the necessary time. We came back to Nagpur on the 11th January and on the following day held a sitting with a view to go into the question. We had a most pleasant surprise in store for us. At the commencement of the proceedings it was stated on behalf of the Musalmans that while they fully believed that there was a custom to stop all music when passing their mosques they had after full consideration of the matter and in the interests of an abiding unity between the two communities determined to surrender their legal right and to leave it to the good sense of the Hindus to play or stop music as they thought fit. They made it clear that although the playing of music in front of mosques while they were at congregational prayers was most annoying to them they have made up their minds to suffer such annoyance rather than proceed with an enquiry on the merits of the question which in any event was bound to leave unpleasantness behind and retard a speedy restoration of amicable relations. We congratulate the Musalmans on their wise and patriotic determination and thank them for having relieved us of the painful duty of deciding a controversy between the sister communities which had caused considerable bitterness. We asked the Musalmans to give us in writing the substance of their generous offer and close the formal proceedings reserving to the Hindus liberty to submit any statement they might be advised to make in response to the Musalman offer. Both parties filed written statements in the course of the day. The Musalman statement repeated the offer we have set out above. The Hindus expressed their full appreciation of the spirit in which the Musalmans had withdrawn their objection to the playing of music in front of mosques and undertook to see that the Musalmans were put to the least inconvenience consistently with the due discharge of what the Hindus considered to be their religious duty. They reserved liberty to play music along public streets and thoroughfares at all times of the day and night only when such music accompanied what they described as the "traditional annual processions of the royal family of the Bhonslas" and the "traditional Jajoba procession". In regard to all other processions they offered to stop music when passing five specified mosques named below between the hours of one and one thirty p.m. and five and five thirty p.m. in the months of October to February and six and six thirty p.m. in the remaining months of the year. It will appear from the above statements that the Musalmans of Nagpur have fully complied with the resolution passed on the subject by the Unity Conference at Delhi in withdrawing their objections and leaving it to the good sense of the Hindus to avoid causing them any inconvenience. This resolution was passed after full and matured

activity that is calculated to yield immediate returns be they even so small. All people, rich and poor, young and old, men and women can personally help and engage in it if they will. It can as nothing else can bind the city people to the villagers and introduce the educated class to them in a most useful manner. It is the one activity that can be common to all the provinces and all the sects of India and produce the largest economic results. Lastly, though it has a political side, it is in the nature so obviously social and economic that it should enlist the support of all, without distinction of party, who believe in the spinning wheel as a great economic factor and as a factor in village reconstruction.

We, therefore, cannot conceive a more fitting memorial than the universal propagation of the spinning wheel and *khaddar*, and, therefore, invite funds for that purpose. We refrain from naming the sum required for this memorial, as it can absorb all it can receive. The subscriptions given by the public will be the measure of their regard for the memory of the deceased patriot, of their belief in the usefulness of the form the memorial is to take, and of their trust in those who are to handle and operate on the funds. They will be M.K. Gandhi, Pandit Motilal Nehru, Maulana Shaukat Ali, Dr. Prafulla Chandra Ray,<sup>1</sup> Shrimati Sarojini Naidu, Syt. Jammalal Bajaj and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, with power to add to their number.

Pandit Jawaharlal has consented to act as Hon. Secretary for the Trustees and Syt. Jammalal Bajaj as Treasurer. Remittances should be sent to Syt. Jammalal Bajaj, 395, Kalbadevi Road, Bombay or Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, 107, Hewett Road, Allahabad.

A full list of donations will be sent to the press for publication from week to week.

M.K. Gandhi  
Motilal Nehru  
A.K. Azad  
P.C. Roy  
Jammalal Bajaj  
Rabindra Nath Tagore  
Shyam S. Chakravarty  
C.F. Andrews  
Sarojini Naidu  
J.M. Sen Gupta

<sup>1</sup>Prafulla Chandra Ray; b. 1861 at Baruti-Katipara in Jessore district; eminent chemist; educated at Presidency College, Calcutta, and Edinburgh University, Scotland; appointed Assistant Professor of Chemistry, Presidency College, Calcutta, 1889; founded Bengal Chemical and Pharmaceutical works in 1892, represented the University of Calcutta at Congress of the Universities of the Empire, 1912 and 1929, retired from Presidency College and joined University College of Science, Calcutta, 1916, President, All India Social Reformers' Conference, 1917, Knighted, 1919; General President, Indian Science Congress, 1920; President, Utkal Provincial Conference, 1923; first President, Indian Chemical Society, 1924; President, Bangiya Sahitya Parishad, 1931-32; first President, Indian Science News Association, 1935, retired from the University as Palit Professor of Chemistry, 1936, d. 1944



Dr. S K. Datta, Mr. Ahmed Ali, M.L.A., Raja Ahmed Ali Khan of Salempur,<sup>1</sup> Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Quiyum, Mr. Mahomed Yakub, Mr. N.M. Joshi and Mr. N C Kelkar besides ourselves. Mr. Jinnah came in for a few minutes from another meeting (Independent party's meeting) he was attending at that time. Lala Lajpat Rai had asked for a postponement by reason of the inability of Messrs Jayakar, Srinivasa Iyengar, and Jai Ramdas [Doulatram] to attend. We were unable to postpone the meeting on our own responsibility. We, therefore, informed Lala Lajpat Rai that the question of postponement be placed before the meeting. This was consequently done but, apart from the absence of Lala Lajpat Rai and of the gentlemen named by him, the attendance was otherwise also too meagre for coming to any decision. In our opinion there was, moreover, no material for coming to any definite conclusions nor is there a likelihood of any being reached in the near future. We, therefore, see no hope of being able to convene a general meeting of the conference within the prescribed period except upon a requisition referred to by us. The failure to reach a decision is likely to disappoint the public. We would, however, advise publicists and others not to despond. That the sub-committee has not been able to reach any decision is no reason for individuals or groups to relax their efforts towards the solution.

There still remains to mention the Swaraj scheme framed by the sub-committee under Dr. Besant. Dissenting notes are being received by us from members of that committee. In view, however, of the meagre attendance and failure to reach a decision on the Hindu-Muslim problem the scheme could not be considered by the meeting.

## 12. *An Appeal for All India Deshabandhu Memorial*<sup>2</sup>

We, the undersigned, are of opinion that an All-India Memorial Fund is as much a necessity as an All-Bengal one to perpetuate the memory of Deshabandhu Chittaranjan Das. He was as much an All-India man as he was an All-Bengal man. Just as we know what Deshabandhu would have himself wished us to do as an All-Bengal Memorial, so do we know what he would have wished us to do regarding an All-India Memorial. His idea was clearly expressed over a year ago and repeated in his Faridpur speech that village reconstruction was the thing dearest and nearest to his heart for the regeneration of India and for the attainment of Swaraj, along peaceful and evolutionary lines.

We know too that he believed that the beginning and the centre of such activity lay in the revival and development of hand-spinning in the villages and universalisation of *khaddar*. It is the one activity that can be made common to All-India and yet can be handled with the least cost. It is the one

<sup>1</sup>Ahmad Ali Khan Alvi, Raja of Salempur, b. 1891; succeeded his father as taluqdar in 1914; became Raja, 1921; member, U P Legislative Council, 1924-35; Minister of Education in Nawab of Chhatari's Ministry. U.P., April-July 1937; Knighted, 1943; member, Viceroy's Defence Council, 1945-46, President, Shia Central Board of Waqf, U.P.; d. 1961.

<sup>2</sup>Forward, 23 July 1925.

## APPENDIX II

## MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

13. A Note on Khaddar<sup>1</sup>

Whatever other differences there may be between the two parties in the Congress the one item which is the common plank where both the parties meet is Khaddar. I desire to lay before you with the practical experience I have had in the production of Khaddar, a practical scheme for the vigorous propagation of Khaddar. People learn and take to spinning very easily. The only difficulty in the way of progress is the scarcity of carded cotton. We do not generally get machine carded cotton. Also, many people object to the use of such machine carded cotton. Speaking of the ideal, we ought not to use mill carded cotton. I think these men who follow the pure ideal can introduce the automatic carding machine, which is worked by the hand—exhibited at the Gaya Congress by Swaraj & Co. of Cawnpore. Speaking from commercial point of view I think we must introduce carding machines used in the mills on a large scale. Had not Khaddar been placed as the most important item in the programme that has been sketched out and placed before the country for the attainment of Swaraj, I would not have recommended this step in getting carded cotton. It might be asked how this use of mill carded cotton will hasten the advent of Swaraj?

## ORGANISE INDIAN MILL-OWNER

The mill-owners throughout India may not accept the programme of Non-Co-operation. But Congress workers, in their individual capacity have to organise these mill-owners into a separate *entente*. This later group will have to purchase all cotton produced in India. They should arrange also, to spin in their mills only finer counts, say above 20 counts. Combodia and other kinds of long stapled cotton yielding finer counts might be used by them. The finer counts thus produced, may also be sent to foreign countries. Short stapled cotton may be carded in their mills and supplied through organised agencies to groups of villages for hand-spinning. In making this readjustment the mill-owner should charge their establishment and other charges and also their total profits to the higher counts. Thus we could get carded cotton at cost price. Should some of the foreign mill-owners and such of our own men who wish to side with them in their opinion refuse to abide by this arrangement and spin lower counts we should see to it that they cannot compete with our hand-spun yarn. Therefore, it is that we should supply carded cotton at cost price. This might in itself appear impracticable. The only solution for this is to organise labour.

Nilratan Sarkar<sup>1</sup>  
 Satish Ch. Das Gupta  
 B.F. Barucha<sup>2</sup>  
 Nirmal Ch. Chunder<sup>3</sup>  
 Bidhan Ch. Roy  
 Satyananda Bose<sup>4</sup>  
 Sarat Ch. Bose  
 Nalini Ranjan Sarkar

<sup>1</sup>Nilratan Sarkar; b. 1861; an eminent physician, staunch nationalist and an advocate of Western education; member, Indian National Congress, 1890-1919, Bengal Legislative Council, 1912-21; founder-member and President of Carmichael Medical College, Calcutta, 1916, Vice-Chancellor, Calcutta University, 1919-21, Vice-President, Indian Association, 1921-24, President, Council of Postgraduate Teaching in Arts, 1924-27, Council of Postgraduate Teaching in Science, 1924-43, Calcutta University, President, Sadharan Brahma Samaj, d. 1943.

<sup>2</sup>B.F. Bharucha; b. 1880, an accountant by profession; attended the Nagpur Congress in 1920, founder, Parsi Rajkiya Sabha to awaken the political consciousness in his community; Editor, *Hindi Mitra* (Gujarati and English), took an active part in the Parsi Panchayat Reform Party; founded welfare centres for poor Parsi girls in Bombay, Poona and Calcutta; d. 1963.

<sup>3</sup>Nirmal Chandra Chunder; b. 1888; one of the Big Five in Bengal politics, Councillor, Calcutta Municipality, 1915-21, close associate of C.R. Das; member, Bengal Legislative Council, 1923-26, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1927-30, 1937-45; joined the Congress Nationalist Party, Mayor, Calcutta Corporation, 1953; d. 1953.

<sup>4</sup>Satyananda Bose; b. 1866, lawyer, gave up practice in 1895 and devoted himself to public activities, associated with the Congress for about fifty years; took part in the anti-partition agitation, 1905; Joint Secretary, Indian National Congress, 1906, along with Bhupendranath Bose was Secretary of the Bengal P.C.C., 1906-16; Secretary, Reception Committee, Calcutta sessions of the Congress in 1911 and 1917; associated with many educational, social, industrial and technical institutions; Director, Bengal Chemical and Pharmaceutical Works Ltd. for twenty years; Trustee, Albert Hall, d. 1948.

## APPENDIX II

### MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

#### 13. *A Note on Khaddar*<sup>1</sup>

Whatever other differences there may be between the two parties in the Congress the one item which is the common plank where both the parties meet is Khaddar. I desire to lay before you with the practical experience I have had in the production of Khaddar, a practical scheme for the vigorous propagation of Khaddar. People learn and take to spinning very easily. The only difficulty in the way of progress is the scarcity of carded cotton. We do not generally get machine carded cotton. Also, many people object to the use of such machine carded cotton. Speaking of the ideal, we ought not to use mill carded cotton. I think these men who follow the pure ideal can introduce the automatic carding machine, which is worked by the hand—exhibited at the Gaya Congress by Swaraj & Co. of Cawnpore. Speaking from commercial point of view I think we must introduce carding machines used in the mills on a large scale. Had not Khaddar been placed as the most important item in the programme that has been sketched out and placed before the country for the attainment of Swaraj, I would not have recommended this step in getting carded cotton. It might be asked how this use of mill carded cotton will hasten the advent of Swaraj?

#### ORGANISE INDIAN MILL-OWNER

The mill-owners throughout India may not accept the programme of Non-Co-operation. But Congress workers, in their individual capacity have to organise these mill-owners into a separate *entente*. This later group will have to purchase all cotton produced in India. They should arrange also, to spin in their mills only finer counts, say above 20 counts. Combodia and other kinds of long stapled cotton yielding finer counts might be used by them. The finer counts thus produced, may also be sent to foreign countries. Short stapled cotton may be carded in their mills and supplied through organised agencies to groups of villages for hand-spinning. In making this readjustment the mill-owner should charge their establishment and other charges and also their total profits to the higher counts. Thus we could get carded cotton at cost price. Should some of the foreign mill-owners and such of our own men who wish to side with them in their opinion refuse to abide by this arrangement and spin lower counts we should see to it that they cannot compete with our hand-spun yarn. Therefore, it is that we should supply carded cotton at cost price. This might in itself appear impracticable. The only solution for this is to organise labour.

Nilratan Sarkar<sup>1</sup>  
 Satish Ch. Das Gupta  
 B.F. Barucha<sup>2</sup>  
 Nirmal Ch. Chunder<sup>3</sup>  
 Bidhan Ch. Roy  
 Satyananda Bose<sup>4</sup>  
 Sarat Ch. Bose  
 Nalini Ranjan Sarkar

<sup>1</sup>Nilratan Sarkar; b. 1861; an eminent physician, staunch nationalist and an advocate of Western education; member, Indian National Congress, 1890-1919, Bengal Legislative Council, 1912-21; founder-member and President of Carmichael Medical College, Calcutta, 1916; Vice-Chancellor, Calcutta University, 1919-21, Vice-President, Indian Association, 1921-24; President, Council of Postgraduate Teaching in Arts, 1924-27, Council of Postgraduate Teaching in Science, 1924-43, Calcutta University, President, Sadharan Brahmo Samaj, d. 1943.

<sup>2</sup>B.F. Bharucha; b. 1880; an accountant by profession; attended the Nagpur Congress in 1920; founder, Parsi Rajkiya Sabha to awaken the political consciousness in his community; Editor, *Hindi Mura* (Gujarati and English), took an active part in the Parsi Panchayat Reform Party; founded welfare centres for poor Parsi girls in Bombay, Poona and Calcutta; d. 1963.

<sup>3</sup>Nirmal Chandra Chunder; b. 1888; one of the Big Five in Bengal politics, Councillor, Calcutta Municipality, 1915-21, close associate of C.R. Das; member, Bengal Legislative Council, 1923-26, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1927-30, 1937-45, joined the Congress Nationalist Party, Mayor, Calcutta Corporation, 1953; d. 1953.

<sup>4</sup>Satyananda Bose, b. 1866; lawyer; gave up practice in 1895 and devoted himself to public activities, associated with the Congress for about fifty years; took part in the anti-partition agitation, 1905; Joint Secretary, Indian National Congress, 1906; along with Bhupendranath Bose was Secretary of the Bengal P.C.C., 1906-16, Secretary, Reception Committee, Calcutta sessions of the Congress in 1911 and 1917, associated with many educational, social, industrial and technical institutions; Director, Bengal Chemical and Pharmaceutical Works Ltd for twenty years; Trustee, Albert Hall, d. 1948.

## APPENDIX II

### MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

#### 13. A Note on Khaddar<sup>1</sup>

Whatever other differences there may be between the two parties in the Congress the one item which is the common plank where both the parties meet is Khaddar. I desire to lay before you with the practical experience I have had in the production of Khaddar, a practical scheme for the vigorous propagation of Khaddar. People learn and take to spinning very easily. The only difficulty in the way of progress is the scarcity of carded cotton. We do not generally get machine carded cotton. Also, many people object to the use of such machine carded cotton. Speaking of the ideal, we ought not to use mill carded cotton. I think these men who follow the pure ideal can introduce the automatic carding machine, which is worked by the hand—exhibited at the Gaya Congress by Swaraj & Co. of Cawnpore. Speaking from commercial point of view I think we must introduce carding machines used in the mills on a large scale. Had not Khaddar been placed as the most important item in the programme that has been sketched out and placed before the country for the attainment of Swaraj, I would not have recommended this step in getting carded cotton. It might be asked how this use of mill carded cotton will hasten the advent of Swaraj?

#### ORGANISE INDIAN MILL-OWNER

The mill-owners throughout India may not accept the programme of Non-Co-operation. But Congress workers, in their individual capacity have to organise these mill-owners into a separate *entente*. This later group will have to purchase all cotton produced in India. They should arrange also, to spin in their mills only finer counts, say above 20 counts. Combodia and other kinds of long stapled cotton yielding finer counts might be used by them. The finer counts thus produced, may also be sent to foreign countries. Short stapled cotton may be carded in their mills and supplied through organised agencies to groups of villages for hand-spinning. In making this readjustment the mill-owner should charge their establishment and other charges and also their total profits to the higher counts. Thus we could get carded cotton at cost price. Should some of the foreign mill-owners and such of our own men who wish to side with them in their opinion refuse to abide by this arrangement and spin lower counts we should see to it that they cannot compete with our hand-spun yarn. Therefore, it is that we should supply carded cotton at cost price. This might in itself appear impracticable. The only solution for this is to organise labour.

<sup>1</sup> AICC Papers.

## ORGANISE LABOUR

The labourers in the mills in the coal mines and allied trades should be organised. When we set ourselves organising them, in all probability, lock out may be declared by capitalists in many a place. We should be prepared to support such workmen in such circumstances. This appeal to the workmen should not be of the nature of the appeal made to students asking them to come out of their schools and colleges, without providing for substitutes. If we should perfectly organise labour we could demand our condition mentioned above, to be accepted. We can force them to do it even if they do not yield, we could create substitutes too. This means a good deal of finances. I think that if without diverting our funds to the payment of vakils who suspended practice to the upkeep of the National Schools and various other items we utilise all our funds for this purpose and organise labour alone, we could attain Swaraj earlier than through any other method. If for three years to come all Congress workers engage themselves ceaselessly to collecting funds and introducing hand-bows, carding-mills, spinning wheels, and the organisation of labour for converting other mills to adopting the programme sketched above, I believe even the Council question and the Boycott of British goods may be left out. This should be taken as merely division of labour as even in our ancient days the caste system was based on this division of labour. Therefore there should be no individual distinction that this is *sin* in this part of the programme and that is pure and spotless and this man is greater for he takes to hand carding and that man is not because he takes mill-carded-cotton. We will have time enough for the attainment of our ideals after we get Swaraj. Meanwhile we have to get Swaraj by capturing these labourers who are economically exploited by the foreigners.

## VILLAGE ORGANISATION FOR KHADDER

We must form groups of self-sacrificing young men for every group of villages within an area of 10 miles; men who would be prepared to devote all their time for the propagation of Khadder. Living by what they get by hawking Khadder and by actual begging of rice if the hawking should not pay sufficiently for their maintenance. This they must pledge themselves to do at least for three years.

## ORGANISE VILLAGE WEAVERS

I have visited several villages, weavers are willing to weave hand-spun yarn, but they complain it is not paying. They are ready to take to this, if they are paid only as much as they get by weaving mill yarn. They also complain that the yarn spun by the beginner is not fit for the warp. These groups of workers have to get wherever available good yarn for the warp, and use the yarn of the new spinners for woof. They have thus to adjust the work. We do not need men who will sermonise on Khadder and its immense potentialities, nor do we need men who will go on speaking about self-sacrifice and its significance. There is determination both in the majority and in the minority in this

## Appendices

particular item. We have to carry on our work only with this determination, for we have not physical force to back us up. There is no difference between five thousand people passing a resolution and five hundred persons passing a resolution if both should simply go home and sit quite after passing the resolution. For a subject nation will and determination are the weapons, if this quality is possessed by the majority party in the National Assembly it will succeed. If the minority party on the other hand has these qualities it will also succeed.

C.V. Rajagopalachariar  
Secretary, Town Congress Committee  
Vellore

15th January, 1923.

### 14. Swaraj Party meeting at Allahabad<sup>1</sup>

Proceedings of the meeting of the members of Swaraj Party held at Anand Bhawan, Allahabad on 28th February, 1923.

1. Syt. Desbandhu Das (in the Chair)
2. " V.J. Patel, Bombay
3. " Professor Ruchi Ram Sahni, Lahore
4. " S. Satyamurti, Madras
5. " Abdul Rashid Saheh of Ambala<sup>2</sup>
6. " Subhas Chandra Bose, Calcutta
7. " Sris Chandra Chatterji, Dacca
8. " D. V. Gokhale, Poona
9. " Seth Govind Das, Jubbulpore
10. " Lala Hansraj of Julluodur
11. " Lakshmidhar Sarma<sup>3</sup>
12. " Pandit Shamlal Nehru
13. " [P]amandas Sugnomal Khatri,<sup>4</sup> Sukkur
14. " Pandit Motilal Nehru

<sup>1</sup> M.R. Jayakar Papers.

<sup>2</sup> Abdur Rashid Khan; b. 1888 at Patiala; educated at M.A.O. College, Aligarh, and Balliol College, Oxford; Bar-at-Law; participated in the non-cooperation movement in 1921 and suffered imprisonment; President, Ambala District Congress Committee; Judge, Indore State High Court; Home Minister, 1938-45, and subsequently Deputy Prime Minister, Holkar State; d. 1946.

<sup>3</sup> Lakshmidhar Sarma; b. 1898; participated in the non-cooperation movement; took an important part in the Gauhati session of the Congress, 1926; member, Swaraj Party; was active in Congress organisational work during 1930-32; Secretary, Assam P.C.C. for some time; founded a national school in Tezpur; took part in the opium prohibition campaign; d. 1934.

<sup>4</sup> Pamandas Sugnomal Khatri, later changed his name to Parmanand Sugnomal Mehra; b. 1901 at Sukkur, Sind, matriculated from Gujarat Vidyapith; Convener, first session of Students' Convention, Sukkur, 1916, Secretary, District Congress Committee, 1920; General Secretary and later Vice-President, All India Printers' Conference, Bombay; associated with Subhas Chandra Bose; Head of the Forward Bloc in Sind and Bombay; arrested in 1932 and 1942; worked for the rehabilitation in Bombay of Sindhi refugees from Pakistan; published *Gita* and *Kathopanshad* in pictures; d. 1969.



## RESOLUTIONS

*I. Resolved that Organisers be appointed for the Provinces as follows :—*

<i>Name</i>	<i>Amount of contribution</i>	<i>Organisers' name</i>
Bengal	Rs. 2,000	Syts. B.N. Sasmal, Calcutta, and Sris Chandra Chatterji, Dacca.
Assam	Rs. 250	Syt. T.R. Phookan.
Bihar	Rs. 2,000	Syts. Rai Hari Prasad, Gaya, Chandrabansi Sahay, Patna, and Maulana Abdul Bari, Patna.
United Provinces	Rs. 2,000	Pandit Kapildeva Malaviya and Pandit Harkaran Nath Misra, Lucknow.
Delhi and Ajmer	Rs. 2,000	Hakim Ajmal Khan, Delhi, Professor Indra Vidyachaspati Delhi, Pandit Radha Krishna Bhargava, zamindar, Muttra.
Punjab	Rs. 2,000.	Professor Ruchi Ram Sahni and Maulana Abdul Qadir, Lahore, and Sardar Jagjit Singh, Abbottabad.
Sindh	Rs. 500	Syts. A.S. Motwani <sup>1</sup> Assistant Editor "New Times" Karachi, and Sukhramdas, Headmaster National School, Sukkur.
C.P. Hindustani	Rs. 2,000	Seth Govind Das, Jubbulpore and Syt. E. Raghavendra, Bilaspur.
C.P. Marathi	Rs. 1,000	Dr. B.S. Moonje and Syt. M.V. Abhyankar, Nagpur.
Berar	Rs. 1,000	Syt. M.S. Aney, Berar.
Bombay	Rs. 5,000	Syt. M.R. Jayakar and Jamnadas M. Mehta, Bombay.
Maharashtra	Rs. 1,000	Syts. N.C. Kelkar and D.V. Gokhale, Poona.
Karnataka	Rs. 500	Syt. D.V. Belvi, Belgaon.
Kerala	Rs. 250	Syt. A.K. Pillai, Trivandrum

<sup>1</sup>Arjandas Sakharmaal Motwani; b. 1895 at Sukkur, Sind; educated at Sukkur and Karachi; advocate; social worker and Congressman; Chairman, Education Committee, Sukkur Municipality; Editor, *New Times*; Sub-Editor, *Karachi Daily*; Notary (Public), Bombay; d. 1967.

## Appendices

Tamil Nadu

Rs 2,000

Syts. A. Rangaswamy Ayyangar and S. Satyamurti, Madras.

Andhra

Rs 1,000

Syts. V. Ramadas, High Court vakil, Mylapore, Madras and V. Lakshminarayana, Guntur, K.V.R. Swami, Rajahmundry.

Members of the Party and those intending to become members be requested to correspond with the Organisers of their respective Provinces named above and to remit subscriptions to them.

II. Resolved that the amounts entered in the above list against each Province be determined to be the contribution of that Province to Central Fund for initial expenses of the organisation and the other expenses of the General Council. These contributions to be remitted to the General Secretary or the Provisional Treasurers before the 20th March 1923.

III. Resolved that the Organisers in each Province be requested to begin work forthwith and specially undertake the following duties:—

(1) Immediate collection of Party funds out of which the contribution of each Province referred to in Resolution No. II should be remitted to the General Secretary or the Provisional Treasurers as provided for by that Resolution. And the excess over the said contribution to be retained in the Provinces subject to the payment of such part or proportion to the General Council as the Executive Council may hereafter determine.

(2) Enrolment of Congressmen in the Provinces as members of the Party and the realization of subscriptions (Rs. 3 per annum) from them. All such subscriptions other than those received from ex-officio members of the General Council to be retained in the Province to be disposed of as directed by the Provincial Council when duly constituted.

(3) Organisation of Provincial Council as soon as a sufficient number of members has been enrolled to be notified to the General Secretary not later than the 20th March 1923.

IV. Resolved that the Provincial Councils when duly elected will at once proceed:—

(a) To appoint the Provincial Executive Council.

(b) To elect 2 members from the Province to the General Council other than those who are members of the All India Congress Committee and are as such entitled under the Constitution to be ex-officio members of the General Council. The names of such elected members together with those of the members of the All India Committee in the Province who have joined the Party should be communicated to the General Secretary not later than the 20th March 1923.

(c) To constitute subordinate Party Organisations, if any, in the Province and notify the same to the General Secretary before the 15th April.

V. Resolved that Syts. Seth Govind Das and Shyam Sunder Bhargava be appointed Provisional Treasurers.

VI. Resolved that a loan of Rs 10,000 without interest be raised within a week for a period of two months for the Central Fund to be repaid out of the

contributions received from the Provinces under Resolutions II and III.

Note Syt. Seth Govind Das present at the meeting kindly promised to raise this loan for the Party.

VII. Resolved that the actual expenses incurred since the formation of the Party at Gaya up to date according to the accounts of the General Secretary be sanctioned and a further sum of Rs 2,000 be assigned for the office expenses of the General Secretary for the next two months.

VIII. Resolved that the President and the General Secretary be authorised to carry on all the duties of the General Executive Council till the said Council is duly organised under the Constitution.

IX. Resolved that a Sub-Committee consisting of the President, Syt. N.C. Kelkar and Professor Ruchi Ram Sahni be appointed to carry out the Party Programme relating to the Foreign Propaganda and Asiatic Federation.

X. Resolved that a Sub-Committee consisting of Syts. N.C. Kelkar (Convener), Kapildev Malaviya and Jamnadas M. Mehta be appointed to take the necessary action in regard to the Boycott of British Goods and make their report within two months.

XI. Resolved that the question of Labour Organisation be brought up before the Executive Council when constituted.

Motilal Nehru  
General Secretary

### 15. The Swaraj Party<sup>1</sup>

At an informal conference held at Delhi on the 24th April attended by Hakim Ajmal Khan, Syt. C. Rajagopalachari, Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, Dr. M.A. Ansari, Mr. T.A.K. Sherwani, Mr. Moazzam Ali and Dr. Syed Mahmud a basis for a common understanding was arrived at with a view to all Congress leaders joining together in pressing a united programme before the people. On the 29th April Mr. C. Rajagopalachari wired to Mr. C.R. Das at Calcutta to the effect that Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel and Seth Jamnalal Bajaj did not approve the understanding arrived at in Delhi. The last attempt to secure complete unity between the two wings of the Congress has thus failed. All members of the Swarajya Party are therefore requested to begin at once an intensive Council propaganda in all Provinces and Districts. They are particularly warned against allowing themselves to be influenced by irresponsible talk of likely compromises as it has now been definitely settled that the work of organising the election campaign will not under any circumstances be interrupted.

Members of the All India Committee of the Indian National Congress are reminded that under Art. 4 of the Constitution of the Swarajya Party such of them as become members and pay the annual subscription of Rs. 3 will be ex-officio members of the General Swarajya Council, corresponding to the All India Committee. Under Art. 5 the President will nominate seven members of

<sup>1</sup>M.R. Jayakar Papers.

the General Swarajya Council as members of its Executive Council (corresponding to the Working Committee of the Congress) on the 10th May. It is requested that members already registered who have not yet paid their subscriptions and others who may desire to join the Party will forthwith send their subscriptions to the General Secretary so as to allow the President as wide a field for the selection of the Executive Council as possible. Each Provincial organisation is also requested to elect two members to the General Swarajya Council and communicate their names to the General Secretary before the 15th May (Art 4).

Provinces and Districts which have not yet appointed their General and Executive Committees are requested to do so and communicate their names to the General Secretary before the 15th May.

No more time is to be lost. An energetic propaganda must begin immediately by organising parties to collect funds and register workers and members. Public meetings should be called without unnecessary delay in towns, tehsils and other important centres to explain the programme of the party to the public. Newspapers favourably disposed towards the party are requested to take up propaganda work and give prominent insertion to party news.

Attention of Provinces which have not yet paid their initial contribution to the Central Fund is drawn to the imperative necessity of their doing so without the least delay and of continuing the collections till they have provided for all their needs. Each Province except Bombay will have to contribute 25% of its collection to the Central Fund. The Bombay contribution will be fixed later in consultation with the workers in that Province.

Anand Bhawan  
Allahabad  
May 2nd 1923

Motilal Nehru,  
General Secretary

4	„ R N. Mandlik <sup>1</sup>	Maharashtra
5	„ D.V. Gokhale	Maharashtra-Poona
6	„ T. Adinarayana Chetiar <sup>2</sup>	Madras-Tamil
7	„ Govind Das	C.P. Hindustani
8	„ R.K. Sidhwa	Sind-Karachi
9	„ S. Satyamurti	Madras-Tamil Nadu
10	„ M.R. Jayakar	Bombay
11	„ V.J. Patel	„
12	„ V. Ramadas	Madras
13	„ D.S. Ramachandra Rao	
14	„ T.A.K. Sherwani	U.P.
15	„ Nilkantha Das <sup>3</sup>	Utkal
16	„ Mohammad Shafee	Bihar
17	„ Y.M. Kale <sup>4</sup>	Berar
18	„ R.A. Kanitkar <sup>5</sup>	„
19	„ N.S. Paranjpe <sup>6</sup>	„
20	„ C. Venkatarangam Naidu <sup>7</sup>	Madras—Tamil Nadu

<sup>1</sup>R.N. Mandlik; b. 1881; studied at Fergusson College, Poona, and Government Law College, Bombay; paid a visit to Japan, 1910, Goa, 1912; member, Indian National Congress, 1919-27, and Hindu Mahasabha till death; Editor, *Kolaba Samachar*, 1919, *Vihari and Lokamanyu*; President, District Board, Kolaba, 1924-27; member, Bombay Legislative Assembly, 1937-39, 1946-51; President, Prantik Hindu Mahasabha and member of the Working Committee of the All India Hindu Mahasabha, 1947-54, d. 1958.

<sup>2</sup>T. Adinarayana Chetty; b. [1874]; educated at Madras Christian College and National University, Dublin; called to the Irish Bar, 1917; enrolled as an advocate in Madras, 1918; started Salem Urban Cooperative Society in 1906, District Urban Bank in 1909 and was its president for several years; was also connected with the Provincial Cooperative Bank, Cooperative Union and Central Land Mortgage Bank; member, Madras Legislative Council, 1923-30; President, District Congress Committee, Salem; presided over District Cooperative Conference, Nellore, 1937; d. 1937.

<sup>3</sup>Pandit Nilakantha Das; b. 1884; poet and writer; member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1924-30, 1935-45; President, Utkal Provincial Conference, 1934-39; member, Orissa Legislative Assembly, 1952-57; Pro-Chancellor, Utkal University, 1955; Speaker, Orissa Legislative Assembly, 1957; d. 1967.

<sup>4</sup>Yadav Madhav Kale; b. 1881; noted historian in Marathi; a lawyer from Berar; member, C.P. and Berar Legislative Council, 1924-37; President, Hyderabad People's Conference, 1926; member of Academic Council and Executive Council of the Nagpur University, d. 1943.

<sup>5</sup>Ramachandra Anant Kanitkar; b. 1881 at Poona; educated at Fergusson College, Poona, and Law College, Bombay; taught at Aryan Education Society High School, Bombay, for sometime; advocate; practised at Buldana for about 50 years; Secretary and Vice-President, Buldana District Congress Committee, 1915-30; member, Buldana Municipal Council, 1919-37, its President, 1922-31, 1934-37, member, C.P. and Berar Legislative Council, 1923-26, 1930-37; d. 1962.

<sup>6</sup>N.S. Paranjpe alias Tapasavi Babasaheb; b. 1874; educated at Yeotmal; served in the Berar Medical Service, 1897-1902; private practice at Yeotmal, 1902-09, joined *Rashtramata*, 1910, joined the Home Rule Movement of Tilak; conducted agitation for abolishing Baluta system of tenancy in Berar, 1916-21; conducted *Gramam* magazine to revive Village Panchayats, 1930-39; d. 1951.

<sup>7</sup>Coya Venkatarangam Naidu; b. 1890 in North Arcot district, Tamil Nadu; educated at Madras Christian College; merchant, exporter of hides and skins, a leading member of Kamma community, an ardent Congressman; member, Madras Legislative Council, 1926-30, Senate of Madras University; imprisoned during the freedom movement; d. 1948.

- |                                      |           |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|
| 21. „ Satyendra Chandra Mitra        | Bengal    |
| 22. „ Abdur Rashid Khan <sup>1</sup> | „         |
| 23. „ S.A.K. Jeelani <sup>2</sup>    | Madras—N. |
| 24. „ S. Murtuza                     | „         |
| 25. „ Rafi Ahmad Kidwai              | U.P.      |
| 26. „ E. Raghavendra Rao             | C.P.      |
| 27. „ Pandit Motilal Nehru           | U.P.      |
| 28. „ C.R. Das                       | Bengal    |

*Resolution I.* That the following resolution be provisionally adopted subject to consideration at a meeting of the elected members of the Legislatures to be held at Lucknow on the 9th January 1924.

Whereas the reforms introduced by the Government of India Act of 1919 have repeatedly been pronounced by the Indian National Congress and all shades of Indian opinion to be inadequate and unsatisfactory,

And whereas the events of the last three years and the working of the Legislatures inaugurated under the said Act during that period have amply justified Indian public opinion and shown beyond all doubt that the said Legislatures are not only utterly powerless to protect true interests of the Indian people and secure to them the most elementary rights of citizenship but are entirely unable to defend them from national humiliation at home and abroad,

And whereas the Swarajya Party of the Indian National Congress, by its programme adopted in February 1923 at Allahabad laid down certain lines of political work including entry into the said Legislatures, having for its immediate objective the securing of the right to frame a constitution adopting such system and machinery as are most suited to the conditions of the country and the genius of the people,

And whereas in pursuance of the said programme the Swarajya Party has succeeded in winning a substantial number of seats in the said Legislatures at the General Election just concluded,

This meeting of the General Council of the Swarajya Party held at Coochabada this 30th day of December 1923 expresses its full agreement with the resolutions passed at several sessions of the Indian National Congress to the effect that India is fully fit for Swarajya and that there is no justification for withholding it from the Indian people any longer.

This meeting therefore demands that steps be forthwith taken to establish full responsible Government in India and is of opinion that with a view to ensure a proper atmosphere for the said purpose, the following preliminary

<sup>1</sup>Abdur Rashid Khan; belonged to a Kazi family of Sonargaon in Dacca district; graduated in 1917; started his career as an Assistant Headmaster; took to the business of book selling and publishing and established the Bengal Muslim Provincial Library; member, Bengal Legislative Council, 1940-44; d. 1944.

<sup>2</sup>S.A.K. Jeelani; b. 1867; educated at Madras; joined the Military Department, 1888; was in the Burmese War, 1885-89; and in Chin-Lusha Expedition, 1889-90; transferred to the Civil Medical Department, Burma; Medical Officer and Superintendent of Jail, Burma; member, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1923-26, Honorary Magistrate; Proprietor, Khader and Yusuf Bros., Madras; d. 1941.

measures should be immediately adopted:—

- (i) That the elected members of the Council and the Provincial Legislatures do immediately present a demand to the Government, asking for
  - (a) the immediate and unconditional release of Mahatma Gandhi,
  - (b) the immediate and unconditional release of all other political prisoners, convicted or under trial in India or detained in India or foreign countries, on political grounds,
  - (c) the immediate suspension of the operation of all repressive laws and of the orders passed thereunder,
  - (d) the immediate summoning of a Round Table Conference of Representatives of whom 1/3 shall be elected by the elected members of the Indian Legislative Assembly, 1/3 by the Indian National Congress, and 1/3 shall be nominated by Government or elected by such other bodies or communities as Government may desire.

(ii) This Conference will negotiate with the Government with a view to determine the principles of a constitution for India, which shall provide *inter alia*

- (a) for a Declaration of Rights on the lines of the resolution adopted by the Indian National Congress at Amritsar in 1919.
- (b) for the full control of the Legislatures, Central and Provincial, in their respective jurisdictions over all matters of Legislation, Administration (Civil & Military) and Finance and over the Services, Imperial or Provincial.

(iii) The decisions of the said Conference, arrived at as a result of the said negotiations, will then be laid before a new Legislature, elected on a wider franchise than at present to be determined by the said Round Table Conference and the said Legislature shall have the power to frame a constitution for India on the basis of the said decisions and the constitution so framed shall then be presented to the British Parliament to be accepted and embodied in a Statute.

*Resolution II.* That the Executive Committee of the General Council of the Party with the addition of Messrs M.R. Jayakar, V. Ramadas and Dr. Moonje be empowered to adopt such amendments to the provisional demand contained in Resolution No. 1 as are not inconsistent with the principles and policy of the Party. The said Committee is requested to attend the meeting of the elected members of Legislatures at Lucknow on the 9th January 1924 and to carry out the amendments aforesaid without any further reference to the General Council.

*Resolution III.* That the demand as finally settled at Lucknow after being signed by as many elected members of the Legislative Assembly and the various Provincial Legislative Councils, both present at and absent from the Lucknow meeting, as are willing to join in it be presented to the British Cabinet and the Government of India by registered post.

*Resolution IV.* That the Leader of the Party in the Assembly to be elected at the meeting in Lucknow will put a question at an early meeting of the Assembly asking the Government what steps it proposes to take on the said demand. The future action of the members of the Party in the Assembly and the Provincial Councils will be regulated according to the following

instructions;—

1. In the event of the Government accepting the principle of the demand or taking time to consider it, the Leader of the Party in consultation with such other members of the Assembly as may be elected for the purpose, shall put himself in communication with the Government and arrange all preliminaries in regard to the various items constituting the said demand, provided that no modification in any of the sub-clauses of clause I shall be accepted without the sanction of the Executive Committee of the General Council of the Party.

Provided further that the line of action to be adopted by the members of the party in the Assembly and the Provincial Legislative Councils before the final acceptance or rejection of the demand by the Government shall be regulated by such instructions as the Executive Committee of the General Council of the party may issue in that behalf from time to time

II. In the event of the Government refusing to entertain the said demand or after agreeing to do so offering terms which are not acceptable, it shall be the duty of the members of the party to resort to a policy of uniform, continuous and consistent obstruction with a view to make Government through the Councils impossible. Such obstruction should be offered on all occasions when the members of the party by themselves or by joining any other party or group of members of the Assembly or a Provincial Council are in a position to defeat the Government. On other occasions the members of the party in the Assembly and the Legislative Councils of Bengal, United Provinces, Central Provinces and Bombay will take no part in the proceedings and the following instructions will be followed:—

1. The members of the party will accept no office in the gift of the Government with or without salary or other remuneration.

2. No member of the party shall agree to be on the panel of chairmen nominated by the President or to serve on any select or standing committee or commission except when the formation of such committee or commission can be made impossible by a majority voting against every person proposed for election.

3. Members are at liberty to exercise the right of interpellation with a view to elicit information. It is expected that questions will be so framed as not to contain or imply a request for the redress of any grievance.

4. No member of the party shall move any resolution or introduce a bill. Provided that it shall always be open to members of the party to accept on such terms and conditions as are likely to promote the general policy of the party an invitation from any other party or group of members to join the latter for the purpose of defeating the Government on any non-official motion or measure opposed by the inviting party or group of members. Such invitation shall only be accepted when the members of the party by themselves or with the inviting party or group of members form a majority of the Legislature concerned.



7 All demands for grants in the Provincial Councils shall also be opposed. Provided that it shall be open to members of the party with the previous sanction of the Executive Committee of the General Council to abstain from voting on any demand for a grant if there are special reasons in any Province for such abstention.

8. All questions of doubt or difficulty not covered by these instructions or regarding the interpretation of these instructions may if necessary be referred to the Executive Committee of the General Council and the decision of that Committee on such questions shall be final.

9 The members of the party in the Provincial Legislative Council will elect a leader and such other office-bearers as may be necessary at an early date.

10. As very few members of the party have been elected to the Legislative Councils of Madras and the Punjab and no combination with other parties or groups of members is likely to be effective, the Swarajist members of the said Legislative Councils will not take part in the proceedings and attend from time to time only with the object of preventing vacancies.

11. These instructions do not apply to the Legislative Council of Bihar and Orissa as no members of the party as such were set up for election to that council. It is expected however that the Nationalist members of the said council will frame their own rules on the lines of these instructions as far as possible.

12. It is recommended that all Swarajist and other Nationalist members shall attend the meetings of the Assembly and the Provincial Councils dressed in pure Khaddar.

Motilal Nehru  
General Secretary  
Swarajya Party

#### *17. Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Swaraj Party at Nagpur.<sup>1</sup>*

Minutes of a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Swaraj Party held at Tulsibagh, Nagpur, on the 11th and 12th January 1925.

*11th January 1925*

Present

Pandit Motilal Nehru (in the Chair)  
Syt. M.R. Jayakar.  
„ N.C. Kelkar.  
„ M.S. Aney.  
„ E. Raghavendra Rao.

About 35 Swarajist members of the C.P. Council were present by invitation.

1. Read telegram from Mr. C.R. Das nominating Mr. M.S. Aney as a member of the Executive Committee in place of Maulana Hasrat Mohani

[who] resigned. Mr. M.S. Aney accordingly took his seat in the Committee.

2. The situation in the C.P. was fully discussed with the Swarajist members of the Provincial Council and certain resolutions were verbally agreed upon.

3. Messrs Nehru and Jayakar were asked to draft the resolutions as agreed upon and the meeting was adjourned to the 12th January.

*12th January 1925*

Present as before with the exception of Mr. M.S. Aney. Swarajist members of the Council also present.

4. The following resolutions were unanimously passed:—

(1) That the action of the Swaraj Party in the C.P. Council in throwing out the budget in the session of 1924 was both constitutional and justified by the circumstances then existing in the country arising from the stubbornly hostile attitude of the Government of India and the British Cabinet in refusing to make adequate response to the popular demand for Self-Government.

And that insofar as that attitude continues unchanged it would be the obvious duty of the Swaraj Party in the local Council even this year to oppose the Government by all legitimate means in its power.

(2) That on a careful consideration of the speech made by His Excellency the Governor of the C.P. to the Darbaris of the Nagpur Division on the 10th January 1925, this Committee records its emphatic opinion.

(a) That His Excellency the Governor has indulged in a gross perversion of the attitude and activity of the Swaraj Party in the local Council.

(b) That the unwillingness of the Swaraj Party to accept office in the Provincial Government arose not from any desire to avoid constructive responsibility which the holding of office involves but from a reasoned belief that the system of Government in which the Party was called upon to take an ineffectual part was inadequate, disingenuous and deemed to failure as it has now been clearly established to be.

(c) That in regard to the hope expressed in the following passage of His Excellency's speech that is to say:

"We have exercised great patience before taking any retrograde step, in the hope that the members of the Legislative Council would abandon their policy of obstruction. We desire to give them a further opportunity of working the constitution in the manner in which it was primarily intended that it should be worked. A meeting of the Legislative Council will be summoned in March next, when the budget will be presented. That budget will be prepared on the assumption that the transferred departments will be carried on by Ministers, and will include provision for new and beneficent schemes of development in the transferred and nation-building departments. The Legislative Council will thus be given an opportunity of ensuring that the transferred departments are administered on popular and representative lines. I earnestly hope that the Legislative Council will embrace this last opportunity of working the constitution."

7. All demands for grants in the Provincial Councils shall also be opposed—  
 Provided that it shall be open to members of the party with the previous sanction of the Executive Committee of the General Council to abstain from voting on any demand for a grant if there are special reasons in any Province for such abstention.

8. All questions of doubt or difficulty not covered by these instructions or regarding the interpretation of these instructions may if necessary be referred to the Executive Committee of the General Council and the decision of that Committee on such questions shall be final.

9. The members of the party in the Provincial Legislative Council will elect a leader and such other office-bearers as may be necessary at an early date.

10. As very few members of the party have been elected to the Legislative Councils of Madras and the Punjab and no combination with other parties or groups of members is likely to be effective, the Swarajist members of the said Legislative Councils will not take part in the proceedings and attend from time to time only with the object of preventing vacancies.

11. These instructions do not apply to the Legislative Council of Bihar and Orissa as no members of the party as such were set up for election to that council. It is expected however that the Nationalist members of the said council will frame their own rules on the lines of these instructions as far as possible.

12. It is recommended that all Swarajist and other Nationalist members shall attend the meetings of the Assembly and the Provincial Councils dressed in pure Khaddar

Motilal Nehru  
 General Secretary  
 Swarajya Party

18. *Views on Annie Besant's Statement*<sup>1</sup>

It will be remembered that in the course of an interview given to *Evening News* by Mrs. Besant on the 4th July she made the following statement:—

"The late Mr. C.R. Das was very friendly but he was not quite a free agent; he was altogether mixed up with Mr. Gandhi. But he seemed to think there would be no difficulty in getting the Congress to support the Bill, and Mr. Gandhi would not do anything until Hindu-Muslim Unity was attained. She was sure Mr. Das would have signed the memorandum if he had been entirely independent."

On our representative asking Panditji if he knew anything about the matter Panditji replied:

"In the absence of Mrs. Besant from the country, I do not wish to make any adverse comment upon the statement she made after the death of Deshbandhu. I feel however that I must hand you for publication the documents bearing on the question I received from the Deshbandhu which would speak for themselves. It is for Mrs. Besant to explain these documents and for the public to draw their own inferences."

Panditji then handed to our representative two very revealing documents. The first of these is a manuscript copy of the memorandum the last paragraph of which runs as follows:

"Desiring this, we demand the passage by the British Parliament either of the Commonwealth of India Bill, now before the country, or of a measure not less complete in giving India full control over her own affairs. If such a measure, failing of success in the ballot, should not be assigned time for full discussion, or should be rejected by Parliament in 1926, in the autumn of which year the General Election takes place in India, then the question of the refusal of all supplies to the Central and Provincial Government shall be made the crucial question, at the General Election in 1926, and a campaign shall previously be carried on in all constituencies, explaining the condition of affairs, the necessity of refusing supplies where the Government refuses the demand for freedom, and of the nature of the struggle which was proposed and its inevitable corollaries. Let the Nation herself decide at the polls whether she is ready to face such a struggle, or prefers to acquiesce in her continued serfdom, bearing the task of recovering her freedom to a nobler and more stalwart generation. To such a question there should be but one answer possible from every Indian worthy to be free. Not often is such an opportunity offered to the citizens of a Nation to win liberty, once for all, without bloodshed, by their own in-born strength. Times of great decisions appeal the weak but never the strong. Sons and daughters of India, be strong and liberty is yours, to hand down to the coming generations."

This brilliant peroration is not to be found in the memorandum issued to the press by Mrs. Besant, but the following tame passage to which Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru has readily subscribed is to be found in its place.

"We, therefore, demand from the British Parliament the passage of the

<sup>1</sup>Forward, 22 July 1925. Interview to a press correspondent.

This Committee declares that if it is the genuine desire of the Government to carry on the administration on popular and representative lines by bringing about suitable changes in the constitution the Swaraj Party will not be averse to shouldering responsibility provided such responsibility is real and genuine.

- (3) That with a view to make the position of the Swaraj Party perfectly definite and clear this Committee appoints a sub-Committee consisting of the gentlemen named below to go into the whole question and report to this Committee by the 15th February after a careful investigation of the special circumstances of the C.P. and general situation in the country.
- (a) The conditions upon which the lines of policy so far followed by Swarajists in the C.P. Council may in the circumstances be altered consistently with the general principles of the Party.
- (b) The extent and particulars of such alteration.
- (c) The manner in which such alterations should be given effect to.

1. Deshbandhu C.R. Das.
2. Pandit Motilal Nehru.
3. Syt. M.S. Aney, M.L.A.
4. „ M.V. Abhyankar, M.L.A.
5. „ E. Raghavendra Rao, M.L.C.
6. „ S.B. Tambe, M.L.C.
7. „ Ghanshyam Singh Gupta,<sup>1</sup> M.L.C.
8. Dr. B.S. Moonje, M.L.C.
9. Dr. N.B. Khare,<sup>2</sup> M.L.C.

Mr. M.V. Abhyankar will act as Secretary of the Committee and 5 members shall form the quorum.

Motilal Nehru,  
General Secretary

<sup>1</sup>Ghanshyam Singh Gupta; b. 1885, educated at Raipur, Jabalpur and Allahabad; led a college strike at Jabalpur in 1907; member, A.I.C.C., 1912-36, C.P. and Berar Legislative Council, 1923-29, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1934-36; Speaker, C.P. and Berar Legislative Assembly, 1937-52; nominated to the Constituent Assembly; President, All India Satyarthi Prakash Defence Committee, 1946; President of Committee set up for rendering Draft Constitution of India into Hindi; organised 'Save Hindi' agitation in the Punjab, 1957, Chairman, Language Experts Conference; appointed Vigilance Officer of Raipur Division by M.P. Government to enquire into public complaints in 1964; d. 1976.

<sup>2</sup>Dr. N.B. Khare; b. 1883 at Panval, Bombay; educated at Jabalpur and Lahore; joined Provincial Medical Service, C.P. and Berar, 1907, resigned in 1916; member, Reception Committee, Nagpur Congress session, 1920; Editor, *Turun Bharat*, member, C.P. and Berar Legislative Council, 1923-29, Indian Legislative Assembly, 1935-37; President, Nagpur P.C.C., 1937, Premier, C.P. and Berar, 1937-38, resigned due to differences with Mahatma Gandhi and Congress Working Committee on the issue of democracy in the Congress; member, Viceroy's Executive Council, 1939-43, President, Hindu Mahasabha, 1940-50; Prune Minister, Alwar State, 1947, represented Alwar State in the Constituent Assembly, 1947-48; member, Lok Sabha, 1952-57; d. 1969.

## APPENDIX III

### ENCLOSURES TO LETTERS

#### 1. Letter from Taraknath Das to Motilal Nehru<sup>1</sup>

Oct. 12-23.

Bande Mataram:

Panditjee:

1. About 5 days ago I received a letter from Pandit Jawaharlal; but to my great sorrow I saw in the *London Times* yesterday that he has been again arrested. Among the young leaders of India Jawaharlal, from my humble point of view, has no equal—from distance I keep watch on Indian affairs as unbiassedly as possible—I extend my most sincere and deepest sympathy to you and the members of the family.

2. What yourself, Pandit Malaviya, Lalaji, Desbbandhu Das are doing the future generation will be able to make proper estimate. Building up a nation—educating the public to be ready to demand and acquire Independence is not a day's or year's work—but we must have sure foundation.

3. I am enclosing some materials which may be of interest to you. I represented India at the World's Dairy Congress [in] which 43 nations participated. The account of it and the paper I read at the Congress is enclosed. I hope this and the other articles will find space in "Independence" (Lucknow)<sup>2</sup> or in some other paper which may print them. I have no extra copies of them so I shall ask you to hand them over to proper parties.

4. I am doing my humble share to carry on work outside of India and in India from outside. I have no economic independence and I am not only lecturing all over America, I am a candidate for Ph. D. in International Politics and Diplomacy and it keeps me busy. If any paper in India makes me a regular correspondent, I can contribute at least one article a week for whatever proper remuneration I can get. Of course this will give me added financial strength to carry on my work.

5. In this connection I wish to say that I believe that ultimately there must be a Republic in India and for this we must have many sided activities and as long as we cannot have absolute boycott of councils we must capture it and use it to educate people and to keep away the unfit from the council & to block all undesirable measures.

6. Regarding the great work of Hindu Mahasabha, I believe that it will ultimately save India—Our Mohamedan brethren put Turkey and Arabia first and it is rather extra-territorial patriotism which makes them anti-English. They talk of Arabian Independence but they do not put the plank of "India, Mother India First". Why should they talk against Mahasabha when it is doing the same thing which others have done. Mohamedan brethren formed Moslem League and asked for *Communal Representation—A Curse to Indian Nationalism*—Now they are crying against the political influence of the

<sup>1</sup>M.N. Papers.

<sup>2</sup>Perhaps reference is to the *Independent* of Allahabad.

*Commonwealth of India Bill* prepared by members and ex-members of Indian legislatures, of all political parties, by the elected council of the National Home Rule League and two co-opted officers of the Women's Indian Association. The country is organising itself in its support and the work will be carried to a success, for when a great nation demands its freedom it cannot long be denied."

The second document is a copy of the reply sent by the Deshbandhu to Mrs. Besant. It is signed by Deshbandhu and runs as follows:—

Step Aside  
Darjeeling  
5th June 1925

Dear Dr. Besant,

I have your kind letters. I have shown your memorandum to Mr. Gandhi who came here last evening and we have both come to the conclusion that whilst with certain necessary amendments your draft manifesto can be accepted by us personally, it has no chance of acceptance by Mr. Sastri, Mr. Jinnah or Pandit Malaviya, not to speak of others who have declared themselves uncompromisingly against civil disobedience. We feel that unless there is a clear understanding among all parties on the exact terms of our demand and upon the remedy we should adopt in the event of rejection, it will be futile to put forth anything as a national demand. The other difficulty in our way is want of a clear understanding between Hindus and Mussalmans, and Brahmins and non-Brahmins. We therefore feel that at the present moment we should concentrate our attention on privately cultivating the opinion of men whose voice counts in national affairs. This I am doing to the best of my ability. I have not wired to you any definite reply as I could not convey to you the above by wire. I am sorry I have not been able to send you anything encouraging.

Yours sincerely  
C.R. Das

So that what really happened was that the Deshbandhu was approached with a document clearly recommending the adoption of the Swarajist policy of "grievances before supplies" in case of refusal by the Government to adopt the Commonwealth of India Bill. Deshbandhu, however, would be no party to the memorandum unless it went further and committed the country to actual civil disobedience if the demand was not satisfied.

### 3. Memorandum for Bombay Councillors<sup>1</sup>

I take the liberty to put before you a few considerations which have suggested themselves to me in connection with the Rent Bills now before the Bombay Council. I have had no opportunity of seeing the text of these Bills but am informed that they are intended to extend the operation of the present Rent Act. One of them sponsored by Mr. Addyman seeks to extend the protection to non-residential premises beyond the first August 1924 up to the end of 1925. The other sponsored by Mr. Nariman has for its object the extension of the protection to residential buildings for three years after the end of 1925 when the present Act will expire.

I do not propose to go into the merits of any of these Bills and indeed have no materials before me to do so. I shall therefore assume that they are unobjectionable in principle. My sole object is to draw attention to the policy of the Swarajya Party as affecting the expediency of pushing these measures through in the existing circumstances.

I understand that both these Bills will be opposed by the landlords and the Musalman Members of the Council, for reasons which it is not necessary to enter into. The simple question which I have to consider is whether in these circumstances the Bills should be proceeded within the present Session.

The aim of the Swarajya Party as its name indicates is the achievement of Swarajya for all Indians. It is not its policy to favour one class at the expense of the other however numerous the former may be. The protection of Minorities is one of the chief planks in the policy of the party. In dealing with landlords and tenants the party lays itself out to adjust the relations between them on an equitable basis. It is impossible to achieve this end by a Majority vote in the Council. The only possible way of doing so is by coming to an amicable arrangement on a policy of give and take. It is obvious that if the rights of Minorities are to be determined solely by the vote of Majorities the Minorities will soon cease to exist. It is this apprehension on the part of our Musalman fellow-countrymen which comes in the way of their throwing themselves heart and soul into the National Movement, and it is to remove this apprehension that the Congress as well as the Swarajya Party has consistently declared that in carrying out the programme of each due weight shall always be given to the Rights and Sentiments of the Minorities. It is therefore in my opinion essential that a serious and bonafide attempt should be made to arrive at an equitable adjustment of Rights in consultation with the Parties concerned before any Legislative measure is introduced in the Council.

My information is that Mr. Nariman's Bill has not been published in the Gazette nor translations in the vernaculars have yet been made and circulated among the public. The Bill itself is intended to provide for the future protection of tenants which stands in no danger at least up to the end of 1925. When I was at Poona last week I suggested a compromise between land-

<sup>1</sup>M.R. Jayakar Papers.



Hindus—a Relapse in the doctrine of Sir Syed Ahmed etc. If the Mohamedan brothers are for India—*let them come out against Communal Representation*. Talk about "National Pact" on Communal Representation basis is absolutely wrong; no veteran statesman of India should agree to it on the plea of Hindu-Moslem Unity. We want equality before law and the government of the wisest & best.

7. If untouchability remains among the Hindus they will be impotent and Mohamedan brothers smaller in number make up with their war-like spirit and extra-territorial connections. At Gaya—a Vidyapith should be established for all the Buddhists and Hindus. Pandit Swami Satyadeva can take up the work.

8. I am afraid that Foreign work would not be supported by the Congress because of expenses but representation of India in Paris, Tokyo and Washington is probably more important than representation at London & Angora. If Congress fails to sanction some money for this work, can it not be possible for 3 Indians [to] maintain at least one real patriot and scholar not a mere politician at Paris, Tokyo & Washington and if possible at London & Angora too

I wish that at least good scholarships be given to the representatives so that they would study and work wholeheartedly and become real scholars in International Affairs to serve India at home and abroad. If anybody is interested to train future Ambassadors and Foreign Ministers they should begin the work now and I am a candidate for securing any such help. Lalaji knows me and now I am free from all organisations.

With my best regards and Bande Mataram

Cordially  
Taraknath Das

*2. Telegram to Kamlapat Singhania and Tejpal Jannadas and Kamlapat's reply*

Messrs Tejpal Jannadas Mirzapur

Messrs Jhuggilal Kamlapat Cawnpore

Painfully surprised at your failure fulfil your personal promise of small service stop leaving Allahabad tomorrow night should like hear about it before leaving wire.

Nehru

Anand Bhawan Allahabad 18-1-24

Cawnpore

19-1-1924

Nehru

Allahabad

Received deeply surprised that you not received yet we already paid to Sabarlal long ago.

Kamlapat

5. Draft Proposals<sup>1</sup>

## (A)

1. This Congress reiterates its belief in the principle and policy of full Non-Co-Operation as enunciated in the preamble of the Resolution of the Nagpur Congress but suspends up to the end of 1925 the programme laid down therein as also in the resolution of subsequent Congresses except the boycott of foreign cloth.

2. With a view to direct united effort to the accomplishment of the complete boycott of foreign cloth & to prepare the country to put the principle & policy of full Non-Co-Operation effectively into practice, this Congress resolves to concentrate during the year 1925 upon the spread of hand-spinning & hand-spun Khaddar, the promotion of Hindoo-Muslim Unity & for Hindoos the removal of untouchability, and hereby delegates to the Swarajya Party the power to carry on, by means of its own organisations, such other political activities & propaganda, on behalf of the Congress, as the said party may decide to carry on through the Councils or otherwise.

## (B)

Whereas the Swarajya Party was started within the Congress in Feb. 1923 by a reason of certain differences of opinion between Congressmen on the question of Council entry and has since functioned on its own lines in the Indian Legislative Assembly & the Provincial L. Councils with considerable success,

Whereas the continuance of the said differences of opinion among Congressmen has seriously interfered with the working of the programme of either Party with complete success,

And whereas it is expedient in the best interest of the country to ensure on the one hand a full & fair trial of the Council policy of the Swarajists with the full approval & sanction of the Congress & on the other hand the harmonious working of a joint programme by all Congress Parties,

## THIS CONGRESS

(a) While reiterating its firm belief in the principle & policy of full Non-Co-Operation as enunciated in the preamble of the resolution of the Nagpur Congress hereby suspends up to the end of 1925, the programme laid down therein as also in the resolutions of subsequent Congresses except the boycott of foreign cloth.

(b) With a view to direct united effort to the accomplishment of the complete boycott of foreign cloth & to prepare the country to put the principle & policy of full Non-Co-Operation effectively into practice resolves to concentrate during the year 1925 upon spread of hand-spinning & hand-Khaddar, the promotion of Hindoo-Muslim Unity & for Hindoos the removal of untouchability.

<sup>1</sup>M.S. Aney Papers.

lords and tenants. I had occasion to meet the Representatives of both and they all assured me that it was not possible within the short time at their disposal to discuss the Bill in all its bearings with a view to arrive at a common understanding. It seems to me that there being no urgency in the matter the right course to follow is to take time by simply refraining from introducing the Bill during the present Session. Having regard to the state of feeling which the Bill has aroused there is a danger of weakening the position of the Swarajya Party on much graver issues than those involved in the Bill itself. I should of course be the last person merely to suggest that the party should be kept intact even at the risk of jeopardising National interest in general. It is really my anxiety for the larger interests of the Nation which has induced me to submit this note for the consideration of the Members of the Bombay Council. My only objection is to the rushing through of a measure of this kind and not to the principle which it involves. I have therefore considered it my duty to lay these views before you to draw attention to a graver danger which seems to me to lurk in the seemingly innocent measure which merely extends an acknowledged principle. I should not have ventured to thrust myself in your deliberations if you were pressed for time. But there being nearly a year and a half for the present Act to run nothing can be lost by taking time over it.

I hope to be pardoned for this gratuitous advice which I trust will be taken in the spirit in which it is offered.

Motilal Nehru

#### 4. Detail of Remittances<sup>1</sup>

30th July 1924	Rs. 10,000-0-0	Paid personally to me.
8th August 1924	" 10,000-0-0	Remitted by cheque.
18th August 1924	" 10,000-0-0	" by cheque.
21st August 1924	" 23,900-0-0	" by 2 cheques.
21st August 1924	" 5,000-0-0	Remitted by cheque.
23rd August 1924	" 3,600-0-0	-do-
<u>Total Rs. 62,5000-0-0.</u>		

N.B. I have not included in the above the first cheque of Rs. 5000/- which you sent me at Simla as your own contribution as I take it to be outside the arrangement subsequently arrived at in Bombay. But if you wish it to be included I shall do so.

either party) as well as what is common to both & known as the constructive programme,

And whereas it is desirable to remove all hindrance to the harmonious working of the existing Party & to secure the re-entry into the

with whom Congress of those who seceded in 1920, and to consolidate all National forces for achieving Swarajya,

THIS CONGRESS

(A) Without prejudice to the right of either of (the existing parties in the Congress) or individual members thereof to enforce the principle & policy of Non-Violent Non-Co-Operation as enunciated in the previous sessions of the Congress when such enforcement does not conflict or interfere with the activity or propaganda of the other party,

And without prejudice to the right of those who seceded from the Congress in 1920 to rejoin it while holding & acting upon their own opinions on the said principle & policy of Non-Violent Non-Co-Operation,

HEREBY SUSPENDS

The said programme of Non-Co-Operation as the National programme except in so far as it relates to the boycott of foreign cloth,

(B) And resolves to concentrate its attention upon the spread of hand-spinning, hand-weaving & all the antecedent processes and upon the spread of hand-spun & hand-woven Khaddar and on the promotion of unity between different communities especially the Hindoos & the Muslims and further to concentrate the attention of the Hindoos on the removal of untouchability,

(C) And recognises the Swarajya Party as a component part of the Congress organisation & its political activity as part of the Congress activity provided, however, that the Congress Executive shall not be held financially responsible for such activity.

(E)

(Final draft by Mahatmaji)

Last draft as suggested by Mahatmaji on a consideration of drafts (C) and (D)

(1) Preamble of draft (D) wholly adopted in substitution for preamble of draft (C)

(2) Clauses (a), (b) and (c) of draft (C) modified as follows:

THIS CONGRESS

(a) Without prejudice to the right of individual Congress members who believe in the principle of Non-Violent Non-Co-Operation to enforce in their own persons the programme of Non-Violent Non-Co-Operation as enunciated in the previous sessions of the Congress when such enforcement does not conflict or interfere with the activity or propaganda of any party,

And without prejudice to the right of the Swarajya Party to enforce its own principles & programme,

HEREBY suspends the said programme of Non-Co-Operation as the National programme except in so far as it relates (to the refusal to use or wear cloth made outside India.)

(b) And resolves to concentrate the attention of the Nation upon the spread of hand-spinning, hand-weaving and all the antecedent processes and

And (c) Hereby authorises the Swarajya Party to carry on by means of its own organisations, such other political activities & propaganda on behalf of the Congress as the said Party may decide to carry on through the Councils or otherwise.

(C)  
(Draft by Mahatmaji)

Whereas sharp differences of opinion have arisen among Congressmen on the question of Council entry,  
And whereas these differences have resulted in the formation of the Swarajya Party since Feb. 1923,  
And whereas these differences have proved detrimental to the best interest of the country & a hindrance to the full prosecution of what has been known as the constructive programme,  
And whereas it is desirable to close these differences,  
And whereas it is further desirable to secure the re-entry into the Congress of those who seceded in 1920, and to consolidate all National forces for achieving Swaraj,

**THIS CONGRESS**

(A) Without prejudice to the right of individual Congress members who believe in the principle of Non-Violent Non-Co-Operation to enforce in their own persons the programme of Non-Violent Non-Co-Operation as enunciated in the previous sessions of the Congress, hereby suspends the said programme of Non-Co-Operation as the National programme except in so far as it affects the boycott of foreign cloth,

(B) And resolves to concentrate the attention of the Nation upon the spread of hand-spinning, hand-weaving and all the antecedent process and upon the spread of hand-spun & hand-woven Khaddar and on promotion of unity between different communities especially the Hindoos & the Muslims & further concentrate the attention of the Hindoos on the removal of untouchability,

How this clause without any amendment of the constitution can make Swarajya Party and its activities part of Congress organisation.

(C) And recognises the Swarajya Party as part of the Congress organisation and its political activity, apart from the programme referred to in clause B shall be deemed part of the Congress activity.

Provided, however, that the Congress Executive shall not be held financially or otherwise, responsible for such activity.

(D)  
(Draft by Pandit Motilal Nehru)

Whereas sharp differences of opinion have arisen among Congressmen on the question of Council entry,  
And whereas these differences have resulted in the formation of the Swarajya Party since Feb. 1923,  
And whereas the said differences have proved detrimental to the best interests of the country and a hindrance (to the full prosecution of the programme of

Your telegram Azad already wired going alone will be useless as agreement in favour of both.

Copy of telegram dated 11-12-24 from Pandit Motilal Nehru to Maulana Abul Kalam Azad.

Nagpur people clamouring for our early decision wire earliest possible date our meeting Nagpur.

#### *10. Swaraj Party Resolutions<sup>1</sup>*

##### RESOLUTION

That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to so amend the Rules and Regulations for the election of members of the Legislative Assembly and the Provincial Councils as to remove all disqualifications to vote or stand for election against persons convicted of political and other offences not involving moral turpitude and sentenced to any term of imprisonment.

##### RESOLUTION

This Assembly recommends to His Excellency the Governor General in Council that, whenever there are occasions for insurance or renewal of insurance of properties or stores or machinery belonging to or held in trust by the Government of India, against Fire, Marine or any other kind of risk, such insurances be always placed with Insurance Companies incorporated in India.

And (c) Hereby authorises the Swarajya Party to carry on by means of its own organisations, such other political activities & propaganda on behalf of the Congress as the said Party may decide to carry on through the Councils or otherwise.

(C)

(Draft by Mahatmajī)

Whereas sharp differences of opinion have arisen among Congressmen on the question of Council entry,

And whereas these differences have resulted in the formation of the Swarajya Party since Feb. 1923,

And whereas these differences have proved detrimental to the best interest of the country & a hindrance to the full prosecution of what has been known as the constructive programme,

And whereas it is desirable to close these differences,

And whereas it is further desirable to secure the re-entry into the Congress of those who seceded in 1920, and to consolidate all National forces for achieving Swaraj,

THIS CONGRESS

(A) Without prejudice to the right of individual Congress members who believe in the principle of Non-Violent Non-Co-Operation to enforce in their own persons the programme of Non-Violent Non-Co-Operation as enunciated in the previous sessions of the Congress, hereby suspends the said programme of Non-Co-Operation as the National programme except in so far as it affects the boycott of foreign cloth.

(B) And resolves to concentrate the attention of the Nation upon the spread of hand-spinning, hand-weaving and all the antecedent process and upon the spread of hand-spun & hand-woven Khaddar and on promotion of unity between different communities especially the Hindoos & the Muslims & further concentrate the attention of the Hindoos on the removal of untouchability.

How this clause without any amendment of the constitution can make Swarajya Party and its activities part of Congress organisation.

(C) And recognises the Swarajya Party as part of the Congress organisation and its political activity, apart from the programme referred to in clause B shall be deemed part of the Congress activity.

Provided, however, that the Congress Executive shall not be held financially or otherwise, responsible for such activity.

(D)

(Draft by Pandit Motilal Nehru)

upon the spread of hand-spun & hand-woven Khaddar & on promotion of unity between different communities especially the Hindoos & the Muslims and from the side of the Hindoos on the removal of untouchability,

(c) And recognises the Swarajya Party as part of the Congress organisation and its political activity other than the joint activity referred to in clause B as part of the Congress activity provided, however, that the Congress Executive shall not be financially responsible for or bound by such other activity.

(F)  
(Proposal by Nehru)  
FRANCHISE

For the words "Paying a subscription of four annas per year" substitute the following in Para 1 of Article 7 of the Constitution.

"Making a monthly contribution of 2000 yards of Cotton yarn spun by himself or a member of his family or of 4000 yards spun by any other person".

In the second para of Article 7 omit the words "the four-anna".

(G)  
(by Mahatmaji)  
FRANCHISE

(a) For the words "Paying a subscription of four annas per year" substitute the following in para 1 of Article 7 of the Constitution.

"Who shall wear hand-spun & hand-woven Khaddar and who shall make a monthly contribution of 2000 yards of even Cotton yarn spun by himself or herself, or when disabled from any cause, by a member of his or her family, or 4000 yards spun by any other person."

(b) In para 2 of Article 7 omit the words "the four-anna."

## 6. Draft Resolution<sup>1</sup>

In view of the disastrous results of the Currency Policy adopted by the Secretary of State on the recommendations of the Babington Smith Committee of 1919 and its admitted failure and in view of the continued hesitation of the Government of India to declare their policy in this matter so vital to the economic interests of this country, this Assembly recommends to the Governor-General-in-Council that a Committee with a majority of Indian non-officials on it, and with an Indian Chairman be immediately appointed to examine the whole question of Exchange and Currency in the light of the experience gained since the date of the publication of the Babington Smith Report,

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.).



Your telegram Azad already wired going alone will be useless as agreement in favour of both.

Copy of telegram dated 11-12-24 from Pandit Motilal Nehru to Maulana Abul Kalam Azad.

Nagpur people clamouring for our early decision wire earliest possible date our meeting Nagpur.

#### 10. Swaraj Party Resolutions<sup>1</sup>

### RESOLUTION

That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to so amend the Rules and Regulations for the election of members of the Legislative Assembly and the Provincial Councils as to remove all disqualifications to vote or stand for election against persons convicted of political and other offences not involving moral turpitude and sentenced to any term of imprisonment.

### RESOLUTION

This Assembly recommends to His Excellency the Governor General in Council that, whenever there are occasions for insurance or renewal of insurance of properties or stores or machinery belonging to or held in trust by the Government of India, against Fire, Marine or any other kind of risk, such insurances be always placed with Insurance Companies incorporated in India.

### RESOLUTION

With a view to make the protection to the iron and steel industry in India real and effective this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to direct that the Government of India and all departments under its control shall purchase iron and steel of Indian origin.

### RESOLUTION

This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he be pleased to instruct the local administrations under his direct control to take steps forthwith to organise hand-spinning and hand-weaving on a large scale with a view to relieve unemployment and poverty within those areas.

### RESOLUTION

This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to convey to His Majesty's Government the considered opinion of this Assembly that

and enforced in all local areas for stopping the slaughter of—

- (1) prime and milch cows—milch cows meaning cows that are actually in milk or capable of bearing calf;
- (2) all pregnant animals;
- (3) breeding bulls, especially Brahmini bulls, draught and plough bulls and bullocks;
- (4) she-buffaloes and goats capable of bearing;
- (5) young stock, i.e. calves, and
- (6) that the existing laws on the subject be so amended as to give effect to this resolution, provided that this restriction will not apply to sacrifices of cattle on religious occasions.

### *9. Copies of Telegrams<sup>1</sup>*

Copy of telegram from Pandit Motilal Nehru to Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Calcutta, dated 28-11-24.

Nagpur people insist our arbitrations by middle December will fifteenth sixteenth suit you wire.

Copy of telegram dated 1-12-1924 from Pandit Motilal Nehru to Dr. Moonje.

On receipt your letter I wired Maulana Azad proposing fifteenth December for Nagpur but no reply yet wiring again.

Copy of telegram dated 2-12-24 from Pandit Motilal Nehru to Sjt. Gopalrao Dalvi, Nagpur.

Your letter had proposed fifteenth December but Abul Kalam Azad wants January Have again wired advise you wire him direct care Khilafat Bombay.

Copy of telegram dated 2-12-24 from Sjt. Gopalrao Dalvi to Pandit Motilal Nehru.

Your wire to Doctor Moonje people anxious for your immediate decision before old governor goes kindly wire Maulana Azad again otherwise come alone.

Copy of telegram dated 3-12-24 from Pandit Motilal Nehru to Sjt. G. Dalvi.

their customary rights in the interest of Hindu-Muslim unity in particular and the country in general and the two arbitrators viz. Pandit Motilal Nehru and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad be authorised on their behalf to leave the matter to the good sense of the Hindu brethren who, if they so desire, may play music or in conformity with the long established custom may stop music while passing the Mosques

(Signed) Lal Mohamed; Yusuf Khan; Mohamed Kasem Khan; Ahmed Khan; Mohamed Alim; M.A. Siddiqui; Nizamuddin Khan; Badruddin; Mohamed Husain; Mohamed Akbar Husain; Abdur Rashid; Husain Khan; Sultan Beg; Sheikh Ibrahim; Abdul Ghafoor; Mohamed Tahir; Abdul Gafoor, Abdul Shikur; Munshi Mohamed Ali; Mohamed Amir; Ilahi Bux; Muhi Uddin; Bismillah Khan; M.Y. Shareef; R. Khan (Principal, H.C. Institute); Nizamuddin Khan;

I agree Sd. A. Khaliq,  
six signatures illegible.

While fully appreciating the spirit of our Mohammedan friends in having agreed to the playing of music in the streets of Nagpur everywhere and at all times, and with a view to cause the least inconvenience to all Mohammedan friends consistently with the discharge of our religious duties as Hindus we the representatives of the Hindus of Nagpur undertake to do as follows:—

(1) That Hindus shall not play music of any kind in the course of their processions when the same pass in front of the five Mosques named below any day between the hours of 1 and 1.30 p.m. 5 and 5.30 p.m. in the months of October to February and 6 and 6.30 p.m. in the remaining months of the year.

- (a) Sadar Masjid (Big)
- (b) Lona Sath Masjid of Cutchi Mussalmans
- (c) Shanichar Masjid
- (d) Azam Shah's Masjid
- (e) Chatnis Park Masjid

(2) That the traditional yearly processions of Royal families of the Bhonslas and also the traditional Jajoba processions shall proceed without any let or hindrance along any public street or thoroughfare, at any time of day or night.

Signed. M.V. Abhyankar; B.S. Moonje; D.W. Kathalay; B.H. Shinde; G.D. Dalvi; K.P. Vaidya; K.B. Hedgewar; G.R. Deshmukh; M.A. Deshpande; Y.S. Doke; M.S. Niyogi; N.B. Khare; V. Gujor.

## 12. Report of the Swaraj Sub-Committee to the General Committee of the All Parties Conference<sup>1</sup>

The Committee appointed by the All-Parties Conference held in Bombay,

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.) and The Indian Quarterly Register, January-June 1925, Vol. I, Calcutta, 1925, pp. 73-6.

in future no loans chargeable on the revenues of India should be raised without previously consulting the Assembly.

### RESOLUTION

This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he be pleased to instruct the local administrations under his direct control to take steps forthwith to grant the local bodies within their jurisdiction the right to determine the number and location of liquor shops within their respective areas.

### RESOLUTION

That having regard to the fact that the Executive in India is not responsible to the Legislature, and the further fact that Committees and Commissions appointed in the past have in most cases resulted in waste of public funds, this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that no Committees for investigation of public affairs should be appointed except with the previous approval and concurrence of this Assembly.

### RESOLUTION

This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to advise His Excellency the Governor General to prorogue this session of the Assembly immediately on the expiration of four years from the date of the commencement of the reformed Assembly and to summon a fresh session without delay in order to enable the Assembly to elect its own President.

### RESOLUTION

This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he be pleased to direct that the report of the Reforms Committee be placed before the Assembly for discussion at an early date.

### II. Statement on behalf of Muslims and Hindus of Nagpur<sup>1</sup>

At a private meeting of the Muslims of Nagpur convened at the Bungalow of Mr. M.Y. Shareef, at 4 p.m. on the 11th January 1925, at which only 60 Muslims could attend on account of short notice, the subject of musical procession in Nagpur was discussed in the presence of Dr. Mahmud and it is once more brought on record that there has been a long established custom in Nagpur to stop all kinds of music in all processions except those processions specially exempted in the order of Mr. Reginald Craddock, while passing the Mosques but having regard to the sacrifices of their leaders they hereby resolve that how much-so-ever painful it may be they are prepared to sacrifice

<sup>1</sup> AICC Papers (Suppl.).

their customary rights in the interest of Hindu-Muslim unity in particular and the country in general and the two arbitrators viz. Pandit Motilal Nehru and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad be authorised on their behalf to leave the matter to the good sense of the Hindu brethren who, if they so desire, may play music or in conformity with the long established custom may stop music while passing the Mosques.

(Signed) Lal Mohamed; Yusuf Khan; Mohamed Kasem Khan; Ahmed Khan; Mohamed Alim; M.A. Siddiqui, Nizamuddin Khan; Badruddin; Mohamed Husain; Mohamed Akbar Husain; Abdur Rashid; Husain Khan; Sultan Beg; Sheikh Ibrahim; Abdul Ghafoor; Mohamed Tahir; Abdul Gafoor; Abdul Shukur; Munshi Mohamed Ali; Mohamed Amir; Ilahi Bux; Muhi Uddin; Bismillah Khan; M.Y. Shareef; R. Khan (Principal, H.C. Institute); Nizamuddin Khan;

I agree Sd. A. Khalique,  
six signatures illegible.

While fully appreciating the spirit of our Mohammedan friends in having agreed to the playing of music in the streets of Nagpur everywhere and at all times, and with a view to cause the least inconvenience to all Mohammedan friends consistently with the discharge of our religious duties as Hindus we the representatives of the Hindus of Nagpur undertake to do as follows:—

(1) That Hindus shall not play music of any kind in the course of their processions when the same pass in front of the five Mosques named below any day between the hours of 1 and 1.30 p.m. 5 and 5.30 p.m. in the months of October to February and 6 and 6.30 p.m. in the remaining months of the year.

- (a) Sadar Masjid (Big)
- (b) Lona Sath Masjid of Cutchi Mussalmans
- (c) Shanichar Masjid
- (d) Azam Shah's Masjid
- (e) Chatnis Park Masjid

(2) That the traditional yearly processions of Royal families of the Bhonslas and also the traditional Jajoba processions shall proceed without any let or hindrance along any public street or thoroughfare, at any time of day or night.

Signed. M.V. Abhyankar; B.S. Moonje; D.W. Kathalay; B.H. Shinde; G.D. Dalvi; K.P. Vaidya, K.B. Hedgewar; G.R. Deshmukh; M.A. Deshpande; Y.S. Doke; M.S. Niyogi; N.B. Khare; V. Gujor.

## 12. Report of the Swaraj Sub-Committee to the General Committee of the All Parties Conference<sup>1</sup>

The Committee appointed by the All-Parties Conference held in Bombay,

<sup>1</sup>AICC Papers (Suppl.) and The Indian Quarterly Register, January-June 1925, Vol. I, Calcutta, 1925, pp. 73-6.

met on January 23 and 24, and elected a Sub-Committee which divided itself into two groups, one to deal with Hindu-Muslim Union and the other to outline a scheme of Swaraj which should establish India as a Self-Governing Dominion, free from interference with her internal affairs. The group dealing with the scheme of Swaraj consisted of 12 members, to whom three were added by co-option at its first and second meetings; I was elected as Chairman, and at the third meeting Lala Lajpat Rai was elected in my stead during my absence in Benares, where I had to fulfil a previous public engagement, which I could not break.

The Committee ordered that the reports of the Sub-Committee should be handed in on or before February 15th, and considered by the full Committee on February 28th. The last engagement has, I understand, been altered, but the sending in of our report is binding on us.

The list of the Swaraj Committee is: Annie Besant, Chairman; C.Y. Chintamani; Shaukat Ali; Mohamed Ali; Jawaharlal Nehru; Hridayanath Kunzru; Jairamdas; M.R. Jayakar; S. Srinivasa Iyengar; S. Satyamurti; M. Ramachandra Rao, M.L.A.; S.K. Datta, M.L.A.; Lajpat Rai; Sir P.S. Sivaswami Aiyer, M.L.A.; Bhagwan Das; Mangal Singh; Jannadas Dwarkadas; Bipin Chandra Pal, M.L.A.; N.M. Joshi, M.L.A.; (Co-opted): A. Rangaswami Aryangar, M.L.A.; T. Rangachariar, M.L.A.; B. Shiva Rao.

Of these ten were called away by their engagements before the fourth meeting, leaving the seven members of the Assembly, the Chairman, and Messrs Lajpat Rai, Shaukat Ali, Mohamed Ali and B. Shiva Rao, twelve in all, to carry on the work.

The Sub-Committee met on January 25th, 26th, February 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 6th, 9th, and 11th. After some general discussion it was decided to lay down certain general principles and to take the draft bill prepared by the National Convention as a basis. The following outline was decided on:

(1) Following the resolution passed by the Indian National Congress in December 1914 at Madras, it was decided that India should be placed on an equality with the Self-Governing Dominions, sharing with them the privileges and responsibilities enjoyed by them as Free Nations.

(2) There should be a strong Central Government in India and therefore residuary powers should be vested in it.

(3) The following fundamental rights were passed by a majority:

(a) No person shall be deprived of his liberty, nor shall his dwelling or property be entered, expropriated or confiscated save in accordance with law and by ordinary courts of law;

(b) freedom of conscience and the free profession and practice of religion are, subject to public order or morality, guaranteed to every person;

(c) the right of free expression of opinion, as well as the right to assemble peaceably and without arms and to form associations or unions is guaranteed for purposes not opposed to public order or morality;

(d) all persons residing within the Commonwealth are equal before the law, and shall be tried for similar offences in courts of the same order and by judicial officers of the same grade, and no person shall be immuned from the penalty annexed to any breach of the law, nor shall such penalty be varied on account of nationality or caste or class or occupation;

to a maximum of 150 and later still fixed at 150.

*(7) The Legislative Assembly.*

(a) The number of members shall be 300.

(b) The age of members shall be at least 25 years.

(c) The duration of the Assembly shall be 4 years.

*(8) The following shall constitute the electorate for the Assembly in each Province:*

(a) members and ex-members of Legislative Councils and of the Indian Legislature representing the Province since the Government of India Act, 1919;

(b) members and ex-members of District and Taluka Boards and Municipalities;

(c) all with education up to the graduate level of diploma granted for training after High Schools or equivalent general or technical education;

(d) members of recognised Chambers of Commerce, Landholders' Associations, Trade Union Councils, Industrial Associations or such other bodies, or all individuals paying such tax or enjoying not less than such monthly income or allowance as may be recognised by rules.

*(9) (a) The Parliament.* The Parliament shall have power to make laws for the peace, order and good government of the Commonwealth in respect of all subjects not assigned exclusively to Legislative Councils, provided that until such time as the Parliament shall, in pursuance of the recommendation of the Defence Commission hereinafter specified, by its own Act, signify its readiness to assume control over the Naval, Military and Air Forces of the Commonwealth, it shall have no power to make any law with regard thereto without the previous approval of the Governor General.

*(b) The Defence Commission.* At the establishment of the Commonwealth and after a period of every five years thereafter, the Governor General in Council shall submit the names of persons, the majority of whom shall be Indians, for the approval of His Majesty to act as a Commission.

The persons whose names are so submitted, if approved by His Majesty, shall be a Commission for the following purposes:—(i) to fix a minimum of expenditure on the Military, Naval and Air Forces of the Commonwealth to form a charge on the consolidated revenue fund of the Commonwealth; (ii) to report on the steps to be taken on the Indianisation and training of the defence forces of the Commonwealth so as to enable the people of India to undertake their own defence as soon as practicable.

(c) In cases of disagreement between the two Houses of the Parliament, except on financial questions, a joint session shall decide the case under dispute after the second passing of the bill, provided that no less than a year shall have elapsed between its first and second passing in the Assembly.

(d) Money bills and laws appropriating revenue shall not originate in the Senate nor be amended by it except with the consent of the Assembly.

*(10) (a) The Parliament shall have the power of establishing or admitting new Provinces and of making laws for their government.*

*(b) In all cases of altering the limits of existing Provinces the opinion of the Legislative Council or Councils concerned shall be ascertained and considered.*

(11) *The Executive.* The Governor General shall be appointed by the King as his representative.

The Governor General in Council shall mean the Governor General acting with the advice of the Cabinet.

(12) *The Cabinet.* (a) There shall be a Cabinet to aid and advise the Governor General in the Government of the Commonwealth. (b) The Prime Minister shall be appointed by the Governor General. (c) The Cabinet shall consist of the Prime Minister and not less than seven Ministers of the State for the Commonwealth appointed by the Governor General on nomination of the Prime Minister. (d) No Minister of State shall hold office for a period longer than three months unless he is or becomes a member of one of the Houses of Parliament. (e) The Cabinet shall be collectively responsible for all matters concerning the departments of the Commonwealth. (f) The Cabinet shall resign when it ceases to retain the support of majority in the Legislative Assembly.

(13) *The Commander-in-Chief of the Military, Naval and Air Forces of the Commonwealth* shall be vested in the Governor General as the King's representative, subject to the proviso in article (9) (B).

(14) The High Commissioner for India shall be appointed by Governor General in Council for the performance of Agency duties in England.

(15) The India Council shall be abolished and the Secretary of State for India shall be placed on the same footing as the Secretary of State for the Colonies in relation to the Self-Governing Dominions.

(16) *The Judicature.* (A) There shall be a Supreme Court of not less than three Justices with such jurisdiction as Parliament shall determine. (B) The Justices shall be appointed by the King and removable by him on an address from the Parliament showing the ground of misbehaviour or incapacity.

(17) All Sessions trials shall be by jury.

(18) *Finance and Trade.* The revenues of the Commonwealth shall be received by the Executive Government with the consent and on behalf of Parliament to form a consolidated revenue fund.

(19) India shall be responsible for all liabilities of the present Govt. of India.

(20) Trade within the Commonwealth shall be free.

(21) India shall have a gold standard with a gold currency and, a gold mohur of the weight and fineness of English sovereign and standard of currency.

(22) India shall have the power of borrowing in any one of the world's markets.

(23) *The Provinces.* The Legislative power of the province shall be vested in the Governor as the King's representative and a Legislative Council.

(24) The power of deciding upon the establishment of a second chamber in a province shall be left to the Province concerned.

(25) (a) The powers of the Legislative Council shall be scheduled.

(b) The size of and the franchise for the Legislative Council shall be determined by means of rules.

(c) The duration of the Legislative Council shall be for four years.

(26) *The Executive.* The position and functions of the Governor shall be analogous to those of the Governor General.

(27) The Constitution and powers of the Provincial Cabinet shall be ana-



logous to those of the All-India Cabinet; but there shall not be less than three Ministers including the Chief Minister in a Province.

(28) *The Judicature.* The existing High Courts shall be the Chief Judicial tribunals in the Provinces.

(29) *Local Self-Government.* The Government of India shall direct the Provincial Governments, within the first year of their coming into power, to reform the local governments, which should consist of District, Taluka and Village Panchayats, suited to the conditions of their Provinces, based on the following principles:

(i) The unit to be the village, with universal adult suffrage and annually elected Panchayats, vested with powers to administer village affairs and civil and criminal jurisdiction exercised by an appointed Bench and sitting in the village;

(ii) the suffrage for the Taluka and District Panchayats to be graded on the lines given in a Schedule, and the general division of functions therein stated to be followed with such modifications as local conditions may require.

(Note: On the above question the division of opinion was marked and no decision was taken.)

(30) *The Services.* Recruitment to the Services shall be in the hands of a Public Services Commission. The powers and functions of the Commission shall be defined by the Parliament.

(31) *Alteration of the Constitution.* The power to alter the Constitution shall vest in the Parliament subject to the consent of a majority of Legislative Councils and also of a majority of members of the Legislative Councils voting on the subject after the next general election at which the issue shall be specially raised; provided that for a change affecting only a single Province the consent of the Legislative Council concerned and of the Parliament shall be sufficient.

Sd. Annie Besant, Chairman; P.S. Sivaswamy Aiyer; T. Rangachari; M. Ramachandra Rao; Bipin Chandra Pal; B. Shiva Rao.

(A. Rangaswami Aiyangar was delayed and will send his copy to the Secretary, with a note Sd. Annie Besant.)

### 13. Letter to the Editor (extract)<sup>1</sup>

But mortals must submit to the decrees of the gods and make the best of the inevitable. Das will now live in the work of his survivors and followers. Fortunately, the lines on which that work has to proceed have been laid down in his last, but not the least, of his public utterances, his now well-known Faridpore speech which may be taken as his last will and testament for his nation. That speech admits of the possibility of cooperation between the Swarajists and Government on terms honourable to both parties. The occasion on which the speech was delivered did not call for any precise definition

<sup>1</sup> Mohamed Ali Papers.

of the terms of that cooperation, but there are persons with whom he discussed them and I happen to be one of them. As you may yourself, Maulana Sahib, remember, when you and I were together at Delhi Railway Station at dead of night in last winter awaiting the Mail Train carrying Mr. Das to Calcutta from Simla, I got from Mr. Das his scheme of honourable cooperation with Government which unfortunately he did not live to develop and make public himself, although it was adumbrated in his Faridpore speech. As all sections of political opinion in the country at the present moment, including the most influential opinion of Mahatma Gandhi, seem to favour and are inclined to discuss schemes of cooperation on which they can unite and present a common opinion on the constitutional position and requirements of the country, it may not be amiss to indicate what I could gather from Mr. Das on the subject in several private discussions to which he was pleased to admit me. The 1st of these took place as late as the 9th of May when I saw him at Calcutta on the eve of his change to Darjeeling. So far as it is proper for me to publish the views of one who is to-day not with us to corroborate [the] same, I can only say that, briefly, his scheme was that the Swarajists could cooperate with Government if the present Constitution be expanded and democratised so as to include the transfer of more Revenue, and with it, of the power to raise more Revenue, if necessary, by taxation to the control of the popularly elected Legislature, pending the final revision and shaping of the constitution in 1929. The only limitations to complete autonomy which I inferred he could be induced to accept up to 1929 were those connected with the subjects of Law and Order, and these, if administered separately on the existing autocratic principles of a despotic Government, would be treated as something extraneous, and not the organic parts of the Indian constitution. It is to be understood that this scheme was discussed only as an acceptable compromise with Government and fell far short of Mr. Das's own ideals of Swaraj and even the political ideals of the Liberal Party who have always stood for complete provincial autonomy even before 1929. At the same time it was agreed that it was not on all fours with the universally condemned system of Diarchy as it has been worked up to now, for it will imply for the people complete self-government within a defined sphere large enough to cover some of the most important national interests to be administered absolutely according to the will of the people as expressed in the Legislature they elect. It will mean the transfer to popular control, absolute and unconditioned, all the subjects and departments of government except one which the British Government seem determined to retain and reserve in their own hands for the present, and in Bengal probably a revenue of 8 or 9 crores out of the approximate total of 12 crores. My impression is that Mr. Das would have been induced by such a scheme which is considered to be consistent with the present Government of India Act to form a Ministry of which an offer was made to him at the outset by the Government of H.E. Lord Lytton in Bengal in consultation with him but under conditions which were subsequently considered as unacceptable by the Swaraj Party.

Now that the Swaraj Movement in the country has been so cruelly deprived by death of its sorely-needed leadership of Mr. C.R. Das, it is to be hoped that his last political message, as outlined here and adumbrated by himself in

his Faridpore speech, might be utilised for the creation of a common platform on which the different political parties in India might be brought on together and lay down the National Demand which the British Government themselves are anxious to ascertain in the midst of so many conflicting opinions. I heard Mr. Das to say himself that he had meant his Faridpore speech, in which he paved the way for the formulation of that National Demand, to be a reply to the invitation of Lord Birkenhead for his cooperation with Government towards the achievement of complete responsible government for India, and the most hopeful sign of the times is that that speech, which was being vigorously assailed for its seemingly moderate tone in extremist circles, has got the warm approval of India's first citizen and political leader, Mahatma Gandhi, who is prepared to discuss the possibilities of cooperation with Government under the present circumstances of the country. Let the Indian political consciousness which has been roused now to the highest pitch under the stimulus and chastening influence of a great national sorrow be exploited by its chief exponents to unite the Nation on some practical steps by which the cause of Indian Swaraj may be materially advanced along the lines which Deshbandhu C.R. Das had last in view.

Yours respectfully  
Radhakumud Mukerji

## CHRONOLOGY

1923

Motilal Nehru and C.R. Das formally announced the formation of Swaraj Party. (1 January)

Attended meeting of the shareholders of Nationalist Journals Ltd., Allahabad. (7 January)

Proceeded to Rambagh (Allahabad) for rest. (10 January)

Attended U.P. P.C.C. meeting, Allahabad. (12 January)

Met a number of lawyers and agents in connection with the case of Rani Phulkumari of Dhampur. (13 January)

Presided over U.P. P.C.C. meeting, Allahabad. (10 February)

Attended a conference of leaders at the residence of B. Chakravarti in Calcutta. (17 February)

Called a meeting of Congress-Khilafat-Swaraj Party at Anand Bhavan, Allahabad. (20-22 February)

Attended along with C.R. Das Town Congress Committee meeting and Nationalists' Conference, Allahabad. (22 February)

Spoke at A.I.C.C. meeting, Allahabad regarding compromise between Congress and Swaraj Party. (28 February)

Attended a public meeting, Allahabad. (28 February)

Interviewed on compromise arrived at Allahabad. (8 March)

Spoke at a largely attended public meeting, Kanpur. (8 March)

At Lucknow. (11-13 March)

Presided over Oudh Kisan Conference, Hardoi. (14 March)

Visited Bareilly, Moradabad, Lahore, Saharanpur and Muzaffarnagar. (15-26 March)

Spoke on Swaraj Party at Town Hall grounds, Meerut. (27 March)

Addressed a women's gathering and attended an At-Home by Meerut Bar Association. (28 March)

Left for Delhi. (29 March)

Arrived at Agra. (5 April)

Conferred with C.R. Das, Sarojini Naidu, Abul Kalam Azad and Shradddhanand on Malkana Rajput question. (6 April)

Attended along with other leaders, a meeting of Mohammedans at Lahore to resolve Hindu-Muslim differences in the Punjab. (8 April)

Visited Multan along with Abul Kalam Azad to promote Hindu-Muslim unity. (10-12 April)

Attended a meeting of leading Hindu and Muslim leaders at Lahore to consider the situation in the Punjab. (13 April)

Addressed a public meeting at Allahabad. (7 May)

Interviewed at Lucknow by a press representative. Motilal was on his way to Nainital. (15 May)

Addressed public meetings on Hindu-Muslim problem at Lucknow. (17-18 August)

Arrived at Lahore to interview Lala Lajpat Rai. (20 August)

Spoke on Hindu-Muslim unity, Gorakhpur. (26 August)  
 Attended the special session of Congress in Delhi. (15-19 September)  
 Attended Swaraj Party Leaders' Conference in Delhi on the failure of a compromise on the council issue with the no-changers. (17 September)  
 Arrived at Kanpur with C.R. Das and addressed a public meeting. (21 September)  
 Arrived at Nabha to meet Jawaharlal Nehru. (24 September)  
 Met Jawaharlal Nehru in jail. (27 September)  
 Issued manifesto of Swaraj Party. (14 October)  
 Attended Leaders' Conference and addressed public meetings, Amritsar. (13-15 November)  
 Addressed public meetings at Kanpur to canvass for Swaraj Party candidates. (18-19 November)  
 Attended Congress session, Cocanada. (28 December-1 January)  
 Moved resolution on Indian National Pact at Congress session, Cocanada. (29 December)

## 1924

Voiced nation's challenge to bureaucracy at Lucknow District Conference. (9 January)  
 Proposed a resolution formulating the National Demand at Swarajists' Conference in Lucknow. (9 January)  
 Elected Deputy Leader of Swaraj Party in the Assembly. (31 January)  
 Called a meeting of elected members to consider the future programme. (3 February)  
 Nationalist Party formed. (7 February)  
 Met Mahatma Gandhi at Poona to review the political situation in India. (23-24 February)  
 Attended a public meeting in Delhi to protest against the Government's action at Jaito. (27 February)  
 Had discussions with Mahatma Gandhi regarding "No-changers and Swarajists". (29 March)  
 Attended a conference at Birla House, Delhi. (31 March)  
 Discussed Hindu-Muslim problem with Mahatma Gandhi. (4 April)  
 Addressed a meeting at Marwadi Vidyalyaya, Bombay, on the political situation. (13 April)  
 Presided over the prize distribution ceremony at a corporation school, Bombay. (18 April)  
 Had a Meeting with Mahatma Gandhi on Hindu-Muslim unity, Bombay. (23 April)  
 Discussed the future of Swaraj Party with Mahatma Gandhi, Jinnah, Jayakar and other leaders. (30 April/1 May)  
 Met Lalubhai Samaldas. (2 May)  
 Met Purshotamdas Thakurdas. (4 May)  
 Conferred with Mahatma Gandhi and other leaders at Juhu. (12-19 May)  
 Gave an interview to a press representative about the outcome of the conference. (20 May)

Left for Simla. (24 May)  
 Met Alexander Muddiman. (12 June)  
 Left Simla for Solan. (13 June)  
 Left Solan for Ahmedabad. (24 June)  
 Attended A.I.C.C. meeting at Ahmedabad and delivered a speech on compromise arrived at between Gandhi and Nehru-Das faction. (27 June)  
 Disagreed with Mahatma Gandhi on spinning resolution. (27 June)  
 At Rajkot. (1-4 July)  
 Addressed members of India Club, Poona. (5 July)  
 At Bombay. (7-13 July)  
 Unveiled the statue of B.G. Tilak at Poona and visited New College, Ferguson College and Anath Vidyalaya. (22 July)  
 Attended Swarajists' Conference in Calcutta. (16-18 August)  
 Arrived at Allahabad. (24 August)  
 Attended Assembly Session, Simla. (26 August-17 September)  
 Delivered presidential address at Unity Conference, Delhi. (27 September)  
 Presided over a meeting of prominent Hindu and Muslim leaders at Allahabad. (19-21 October)  
 Addressed All Parties Conference in Bombay. (21-23 November)  
 Attended U.P. P.C.C. meeting for the election of office bearers of A.I.C.C. (27 November)  
 Spoke at Allahabad on Hindu-Muslim relations. (13 December)  
 Spoke in support of the resolution on Agreement and Spinning Franchise at Belgaum Congress. (26 December)  
 Moved resolution on Kohat and Gulbarga riots at Belgaum Congress. (27 December)

## 1925

At Bombay. (1-4 January)  
 Left for Nagpur along with A.K. Azad to resolve Hindu-Muslim dispute. (9 January)  
 Stressed on Hindu-Muslim unity at a public meeting, Nagpur. (12 January)  
 Attended All Parties Conference, Delhi. (23-24 January)  
 Elected leader of Swaraj Party, Delhi. (2 February)  
 Attended All Parties Conference, Delhi. (1 March)  
 Attended Swaraj Party Executive Conference, Patna. (10 March)  
 Left for Dalhousie accompanied by Kamala and Indira. (14 May)  
 At Dalhousie. (16 May-6 July)  
 Elected President of Swaraj Party; attended A.I.C.C. meeting at Calcutta. (16 July)  
 Accepted membership of Sken Committee. (28 July)  
 Attended meeting of Swaraj Party of Bengal. (11 August)  
 Attended A.I.C.C. meeting at Patna. (22-23 September)  
 Replied to M.R. Jayakar on S.B. Tambe affair. (17 October)  
 Attended U.P. Political Conference, Sitapur, along with Jawaharlal Nehru. (18 October)  
 Spoke at Kanpur. (25 October)

Spoke at Amravati on the resignation of Jayakar and Kelkar from Swaraj Party. (12 November)

Visited Raipur where he made an appeal for Hindu-Muslim unity. (16 November)

Attended Congress session at Kanpur. (26-28 December)

Moved resolution on New Political Programme at Congress session, Kanpur. (27 December)

# INDEX

- A.I.C.C., *see* All India Congress Committee
- Abadi Bano Begum, mother of Ali Brothers, 500, 500n
- Abdul Arif, Maulana, 501
- Abdul Aziz, Mian, 488, 488n
- Abdul Bari, Maulana, 20n, 76, 184, 501, 518
- Abdul Bari, Prof., 145
- Abdul Gafoor, 543
- Abdul Ghafoor, 543
- Abdul Karim, Khwaja, 498, 498n
- Abdul Majid Khwaja, *see* Khwaja, Abdul Majid
- Abdul Majid, Maulana, 286
- Abdul Majid, Nawab, 38, 38n
- Abdul Qadir, Maulana, *see* Kasuri, Maulana Abdul Qadir
- Abdul Qadir, Maulvi, 488
- Abdul Qayyum, 153, 153n, 156-57, 512
- Abdul Shikur, 543
- Abdullah Haroon, 498, 498n
- Abdur Rashid, 543
- Abbyankar, M.V., 67, 67n, 163, 172, 185, 243, 518, 528, 543
- Abhyudaya*, 27
- Abul Kasem, Maulvi, 299, 299n
- Acharya, M.K., 521, 521n
- Acworth Committee, 424, 424n, 425
- Acworth, William Mitchell, 424n
- Addyman, Joe, 533
- Advocate of India*, 167, 167n
- Aga Khan, 474
- Agra, 115, 147
- Ahmed Ali, 512
- Ahmed Haji Siddiq Khatri, *see* Khatri, Ahmed Haji Siddiq
- Ahmed, Kabeer-ud-Din, 340, 340n, 341, 402-03, 423, 452, 457
- Ahmed Khan, 543
- Ahmed Saeed, Maulana, 497, 497n
- Ahmedabad, 14, 42-43, 45, 52, 66, 81-82, 174
- Aiyangar, A. Rangaswamy, *see* Iyengar, A. Rangaswamy
- Aiyangar, K. Rama, 261, 261n, 262, 264
- Aiyangar, S. Srinivasa, *see* Iyengar, S. Srinivasa
- Aiyer, P.S. Sivaswamy, 210, 299, 418, 420, 508, 544, 548
- Ajmal Khan, *see* Khan, Hakim Ajmal Akbar, 471
- Aligarh, 149
- Alipur Conspiracy Case, 400, 400n, 404-05, 438
- All India Congress Committee, 42, 45, 51-52, 63, 68, 84-86, 154, 158, 202, 250, 274-76, 303-04, resolution at Patna meeting, 266-67
- All India Deshabandhu Memorial, 512-14
- All India Khaddar Board, 267, 274
- All India Spinners' Association, 266-67, 274
- All India Swaraj Party Conference (Calcutta), Motilal Nehru's speech at, 231-36
- All Parties Conference, 89, 100-01, 103, 110, 238, 258, 309-10, 511, 543, Motilal Nehru's views on, 304-06
- Allahabad, 30, 32, 40, 42-43, 49-53, 55-56, 58, 66, 84, 113, 116, 133-35, 139, 141, 149, 157, 159-60, 169, 281, 289, 513, 523, 532; Hindu-Muslim problem in, 306-08; Swaraj Party meeting at, 504, 517-20
- Allahabad Bank, 116, 121
- Almora, 149
- Ali, Ahmed Ali Khan, 512, 512n
- Amjadi (Begum Mohamed Ali), 500, 500n
- Amrita Bazar Patrika*, 26, 26n
- Amritsar, 29, 133-34, 451
- Anand Bhawan, 43, 184, 517
- Andrews, C.F., 135, 513
- Aney, M.S., 177, 185, 518, 521, 526-28
- Anglo-Persian Oil Company, 432
- Ansari, M.A., 66, 105-07, 187, 200-01, 283, 487, 520
- Ansari, M.A. Aziz, 500, 500n
- Arctic Home*, 225
- Arora, Narayan Prasad, 34, 34n, 148
- Asaf Ali, M., 67, 499, 499n
- Associated Press, 54, 291
- Ashworth, E.H., 435
- Ayyangar, A. Rangaswamy, *see* Iyengar, A. Rangaswamy
- Ayyangar, C. Duraiswami, 254, 254n, 341-42, 398, 436
- Azad, Maulana Abul Kalam, 67, 92, 99, 105, 144, 248, 289, 487-88, 490-91, 495-96, 513, 540-41, 543; statement along with Motilal Nehru on Hindu-Muslim dispute at Nagpur, 510-11
- Azam Shah's Masjid, 543
- Azamgarh, 148



- Baba Saheb, Tapasavi, *see* Paranjpe, N.S.  
 Babington Smith Committee (1919), 538  
 Bachaji, 4, 107, 137  
 Badruddin, 543  
 Bajaj, Seth Jamnalal, 15, 150-51, 174, 187, 499, 513, 520  
 Bajaj, Seth Rameshwar Das, 34n  
 Bajpai, Pandit Sankanta Prasad, 7n  
*Bakrid*, 188-89  
 Ballabhdas, Diwan Bahadur Seth, death of, 111-12, 112n  
 Banda, 148  
 Bandyopadhyay, Jitendranath, 152, 152n  
 Banerjee, Surendra Nath, 152; Motilal Nehru's tribute to, 460-61  
 Banerji, Captain, *see* Bandyopadhyay, Jitendranath  
 Banker, Shankarlal, 114  
 Bardoli, 264  
 Bareilly, 147, 192  
 Bareilly National School, 23  
 Bari, Khan Bahadur Ghulam, 299, 299n  
 Bari, Prof. Abdul, *see* Abdul Bari, Prof.  
 Baring, Maurice, 334, 334n  
 Barjees, Syed, 501  
 Barnes, George Stapylton, 426, 426n  
 Barucha, B.F., *see* Bharucha, B.F.  
 Basanti Devi (wife of C.R. Das), 53, 53n  
 Basu, Bhupendra Nath, 395  
 Beg, Maulana Umar Daraz, 501, 501n  
 Beg, Sultan, 543  
 Begraj, Virumal, *see* Virumal Begraj  
 Belgaum, 53, 90-92, 95-96, 99, 239, 267, 273n; Congress session at, 68, 509; Motilal Nehru's speeches at Congress session, 241-45; vote of thanks by Motilal Nehru to Mahatma Gandhi at Congress session, 245-46  
 Belvi, D.V., 185, 518  
 Benares, 5, 23, 116, 148  
 Bengal Congress Committee, 202  
 Bengal Criminal Law Amendment Ordinance, 398-413  
 Bengal Criminal Law Amendment (Supplementary) Bill, 455-60  
 Bengal National Pact, 198-201  
 Bengal Ordinance (1924), 296-303, 311  
*Bengalee*, *The*, 142, 313  
 Berar, 163  
 Besant, Annie, 75, 100, 107, 111, 304, 508, 512, 544, 548; interview to *Evening News*, 529-30  
 Beti Saheba, *see* Maha Lakshmi Bai, Beti  
 Betty, *see* Nehru, Krishna  
 Bhagwan Das, 10, 281, 497, 544  
 Bhargava, Bhagwat Narain, 97, 97n, 148  
 Bhargava, Bishen Narayan, 30n  
 Bhargava, Radha Krishna, 185, 185n, 518  
 Bhargava, Shyam Sunder, 12, 12n, 112, 519  
 Bharucha, B.F., 514, 514n  
 Bhattacharya, Narendranath, *see* Roy, Manabendra Nath  
 Bholanath, Mrs. (wife of Colonel Bholanath), 265, 265n  
 Bhurgri, G.M., 353, 353n, 500  
 Bijnore, 148  
 Birkenhead, Lord, 141, 141n, 271, 310, 472-73, 476, 478-80, 550; speech on Indian situation, 310-11  
 Birla, G.D., 75n  
 Bismillah Khan, *see* Khan, Bismillah  
 Blackett, Basil Phillott, 332, 332n, 335, 430, 432-33, 435, 440, 446-47  
 Blaney, Thomas, 167n  
 Bomanji, B.R., 4, 4n  
 Bomanji, S.R., 40, 40n, 100  
 Bombay, 5, 12, 15, 42, 45, 49-51, 53, 60, 62-63, 69, 80-82, 84, 86-88, 90-92, 103, 137, 160-61, 238, 293, 508, 533-34; speech delivered by Motilal Nehru on the occasion of the anniversary of Jallianwala Bagh in, 204-11; Motilal Nehru's public speech in, 211-17; All Parties Conference in, 543-48  
*Bombay Chronicle, The*, 30, 30n, 53, 56, 59-60, 62, 70-71, 82, 86, 102, 117, 120, 223n, 251-52, 270n, 271n, 281n, 318n, 320n, 489n  
 Bombay High Court, 70  
 Bombay Rent Bill, 59  
 Bose, B.K., 235  
 Bose, Satyananda, 514, 514n  
 Bose, Subhas Chandra, 299, 499, 499n, 517  
 Braja Mohan Institution, 406  
 Brar, Hira Singh, 157, 157n  
 Brelvi, S.A., 59-60, 86  
 Brett, W.B., 89, 89n  
 Brown, Kenworthy, 127  
 Burdon, Ernest, 139, 139n, 418-19  
 Burdwan, Nahraraja of, *see* Nahtab, Bijay Chand  
 Butler, Harcourt, 22, 439  
 C.P. Settlement Bill, 215  
 Calcutta, 42, 44, 50, 54, 56, 61, 64, 66, 75, 80, 82, 84, 99, 113, 164, 549; All India Swaraj Party Conference in, 231n; reply by Motilal Nehru to an address by Calcutta Corporation, 236-37; special Congress session in, 437  
*Calcutta Weekly Notes*, 399  
 Calvert, Hubert, 336, 336n, 352-53

- Campbell-Bannerman, Henry, 478, 478n  
 Cawnpore, *see* Kanpur  
 Chakravarti, B., 144  
 Chakravarty, Shyam S., 513  
 Chaman Lal, Diwan, 136, 136n, 176, 343  
 Chamba, 130-32, 137  
 Chamberlain, Joseph, 477, 477n  
 Chandan Singh, Thakur, 7  
 Char Manair Case, 238  
 Charkha, 3, 223  
 Chatnis Park Masjid, 543  
 Chatterji, Jiban Lal, 408, 408n  
 Chatterji, Sris Chandra, 184, 184n, 356, 369, 499, 517-18; on industries in India, 369  
 Chaudhry, Keshav Chandra Singh, 94, 94n, 95  
 Chauri Chaura, 15  
 Chetty, R.K., Shanmukham, 263, 263n, 264  
 Chetty, T. Adinarayana, 522, 522n  
 Chiene, O.M., 9  
 Chintaman, C.Y., 18n, 90, 508, 544  
 Chirol, Valentine, 452, 452n  
 Chitale, G.K., 159, 159n, 160, 167  
 Choithram, Dr., *see* Gidwani, Choithram P.  
 Cholkar, Dr. M.R., 150, 150n, 151  
 Chotani, Haji Mian Mohamed, 499, 499n  
 Chowdhri Jai Narain Singh, *see* Singh, Chowdhri Jai Narain  
 Chunder, Nirmal Ch. 514, 514n  
 Civil Disobedience Enquiry Committee, 37, 183, 330  
 Civil Disobedience Movement, 10, 13-16, 270-71, 277, 283-84  
 Clarke, Reginald, 407, 407n  
 Clyde, James Avon, 444, 444n  
 Cocanada, 47, 51-52, 222; Swaraj Party meeting at, 32-33, 35, 288-89, 503-04, 521-26; Report of the Thirty-eighth session of Congress, 198n, 201n, 203n  
 Code of Civil Procedure, 391  
 Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill, 413-14  
*Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, 217n  
 Commonwealth of India Bill, 529-30  
 Comrade, 86, 86n, 87, 143  
 Congress, *see* Indian National Congress  
 Congress-Khilafat-Swaraj Party, 6, 9  
 Contempt of Courts Bill, Motilal Nehru's views on, 465-66  
 Cotton Excise Duty Resolution, 82  
 Cotton Excise Establishment, 431  
 Cow Preservation League, 97  
 Craddock, Reginald, 542  
 Crawford, Colonel J.D., 418, 418n, 420-21  
 Crewe, 1st Marquess of, 478, 478n  
 Criminal Law Amendment Act (1908), 22, 22n, 23, 40, 190, 216, 220, 283, 298-99, 335, 349  
 Criminal Law Amendment Ordinance, 246-47  
 Criminal Law Amendment (Repealing) Bill, *see* Indian Criminal Law Amendment (Repealing) Bill  
 Criminal Procedure Code, 25, 401  
 Currimbhoy Ebrahim, G., *see* Ebrahim G. Currimbhoy  
 Currimbhoy, Fazulbhoy. *see* Fazulbhoy Currimbhoy  
 Curzon, Viscount, 211-12  
 Dadabhoy, Maneckji Byramji, 38, 38n  
*Daily Herald*, 209  
*Daily Mail*, *see* Indian Daily Mail  
 Dalhousie, 124, 126-31, 134-36, 140-41, 154  
 Dalvi, Gopalrao Dajiba, 92, 92n, 540, 543  
 Damodar Das, *see* Shah, Damodar Das  
 Daoodi, Maulvi Muhammad Shafee, 71, 71n, 145, 172, 499, 522  
 Darjeeling, 124, 549  
 Das, Basanti Devi (wife of C.R. Das), 53, 53n, 78  
 Das, Deshabandhu Chittaranjan, 3, 10, 14, 17, 21-22, 28, 30, 33n, 42, 52, 64, 66, 73, 75, 78-80, 82-83, 102-03, 114, 119, 123, 136, 141-43, 164, 190, 192, 200, 202, 235-36, 241, 243, 267, 273n, 281-87, 293, 295-99, 304, 311, 394, 487, 494-95, 495n, 497, 503n, 512, 517, 520, 523, 526, 528-31, 549; death of, 138, speech at Faridpur, 141-42, 481-82, 512, 548, 550, Das-Lytton negotiations, 313-18; Motilal Nehru's tribute to, 460-61; statement on Council-entry, 504-07; agreement reached at with Mahatma Gandhi and Motilal Nehru, 508-09  
 Das, Manmohan, 172  
 Das, Nilakantha, 522, 522n  
 Das, Seth Govind, *see* Govind Das, Seth  
 Das, Tarakanath, 30, 30n, 531-32  
 Das Gupta, Satish Ch., 514  
 Dastane, Vasudev Vithal, 178, 178n  
 Datta, S.K., 436, 436n, 512, 544  
 Day, Ernest, 295, 295n, 297, 401  
 Dayal, Rai Bahadur Shankar, *see* Shankar Dayal, Rai Bahadur  
 Dehra Dun, 159, 169  
 Delhi, 37-38, 40, 51-52, 66, 77, 79, 81-83, 104, 119, 124, 139, 175, 222, 291, 510, 520; All Parties Conference at, 100-01, 103; special Congress session at, 287, 438; Conference of Hindu, Muslim and Sikh

leaders at, 487-489  
 Deo, Shankarrao Dattatraya, 178, 178n  
 Desai, Darbar Gopaladas Kashibhai, 166, 166n, 167  
 Desai, Mahadev, 83, 83n  
 Desai, V.A., 502, 502n  
 Deshmukh, G.R., 543  
 Deshpande, G.B., 501  
 Deshpande, M.A., 543  
 Dhampur, 4, 4n  
 Dhankoreben, Lady (wife of Purshotamdas Thakurdas), 172, 172n  
 Dhantayagi, 155  
 Dillon, George Wentworth, 4, 4n  
 Dina Nath, Pandit, 500, 500n  
 Dimshaw, F.E., 58, 58n, 59, 61, 69, 81, 91-92, 103, 109; donation for Swaraj Party, 81-82  
 Dike, Y.S., 543  
 Dominion Status, Motilal Nehru's views on, 323-38  
 Doulatram, Jairamdas, *see* Jairamdas Doulatram  
 Duggirala Gopalakrishnayya, 498, 498n  
 Dumasia, N.M., 369, 369n  
 Dunchand, Lala, 8, 8n, 117, 464  
 Durga Das, Rai Bahadur, 488, 488n  
 Durham, Lord, *see* Lambton, John George  
 Durham Report, 451, 451n  
 Dutt, Aswini Kumar, 405, 405n  
 Dutt, R.C., 424, 424n  
 Durta, Bhupendra Kumar, 408, 408n  
 Dwarka Prasad, 9, 9n, 23, 94-95, 147  
 Dwarkadas, Jamnadas, *see* Jamnadas Dwarkadas  
 Dyer, General, 349  
  
 Ebrahim, G. Currimbhoy, 163, 163n  
 Evening News, Annie Besant's interview to, 529-530  
  
 Fardipur, C.R. Das's speech at, 141-42, 481-82, 512, 548, 550  
 Fazl-i-Husain, 157, 157n  
 Fazlul Huq, 143  
 Fazlur Rahman, Syed, 501, 501n  
 Fazulbhoy Currimbhoy, 119, 119n, 162-63  
 Finance Bill, *see* Indian Finance Bill  
 Forward, *see also* Liberty  
 Forward, 32n, 33, 33n, 40n, 117, 167, 175, 204n, 211n, 230n, 231n, 236, 236n, 238, 238n, 289, 291n, 296n, 304n, 308n, 310n, 408, 438, 512n, 529n  
 Fox, Charles James, 346, 346n  
 Free Hindustan, 30n  
 Friend of India, 77n

Fyzabad, 116

Ganapati festival, 226, 228  
 Gandhi, Devadas, 34  
 Gandhi, Kasturba, 499, 499n  
 Gandhi, M.K., 12n, 21, 34, 30-32, 37, 39-41, 46, 51-53, 57-58, 61, 64, 66, 68, 70, 72-76, 78-83, 85-86, 108, 141, 144, 153, 158, 175, 205, 213, 215-17, 237, 239, 241, 246, 269, 273-74, 276-77, 281, 281n, 284-86, 291-97, 303, 337, 341, 394, 444, 450, 482, 504-07, 513, 524, 529-30, 536-38, 550; on Swaraj Party, 87; invited by Motilal Nehru to Dalhousie, 136; and non-violence, 217-18; differences with Motilal Nehru, 217-19; on Council-entry, 218-22; and non-cooperation, 218-19; and constructive programme, 220; breaks his fast, 238; on Rowlett Act, 349; agreement reached at with C.R. Das and Motilal Nehru, 508-09; issued statement along with Motilal Nehru to achieve Hindu-Muslim accord, 511-12  
 Gauri Shankar, *see* Mishra, Gauri Shankar  
 Gaya, 15-16, 231, 281, 285, 532; Swaraj Party formed and constituted at, 10; Congress session at, 183n, 438; Congress-Khilafat-Swaraj Party formed at, 184  
 Ghose, Aurobindo, 225  
 Ghose, Sisir Kumar, 26n  
 Ghulam Mohiuddin, 488  
 Gidwani, A.T., 26, 500  
 Gidwani, Choithram P., 150, 150n, 500  
 Girdhari Lal, 498  
 Gita Rahasya, 225  
 Gokhale, D.V., 67, 67n, 185, 517-18, 522  
 Gokhale, Gopal Krishna, 32; on Indians in South Africa, 350; on partition of Bengal, 350  
 Gokuldas, Raja, 273, 273n  
 Gopal Das, Darbar, *see* Desai, Darbar Gopaladas Kashibhai  
 Gopalakrishnayya, *see* Duggirala Gopalakrishnayya  
 Gorakhpur, 23  
 Gossain, Narendra Lal, 404, 404n, 405  
 Goswami, T.C., 136, 136n, 175, 178, 458  
 Gour, Dr. Hari Singh, 40, 210, 329, 332, 378, 390-91, 416, 446, 508  
 Govardhan Das, L., 502  
 Government of India Act (1919), 257, 325-26, 329, 351, 389, 444, 456, 469, 476, 480, 523; Motilal Nehru's criticism of, 211-17; and Royal Commission, 335, 359; and Round Table Conference, 359-60  
 Govind Das, Seth, 12, 12n, 111, 120, 151,

- 167, 185, 272-73, 517-20, 522  
 Govindanand, Swami, 242, 242n, 243  
 Graham, Lancelot, 417, 417n  
 Gresham, 129, 133  
 Griffith, Arthur, founder of Sinn Féin, 36n  
 Gujarat, 3  
 Gujor, V., 543  
 Gulbarga Riots, 243, 243n, 244-45  
 Gulshan Rai, Prof., 488, 488n  
 Gupta, Ghanshyam Singh, 528, 528n  
 Gupta, Shiv Prasad, 501  
 Guru Ka Bagh, 349
- Habibur Rahman, Maulana, 501, 501n  
 Hailey, Malcolm, 207, 254, 378, 442, 475  
 Haileybury, 382  
 Hakim Abdul Wali, *see* Wali, Hakim Abdul  
 Hakim Ajmal Khan, *see* Khan, Hakim Ajmal  
 Haldar, Basanti Devi, *see* Das, Basanti Devi  
*Hamdam*, 20, 20n, 286  
 Hari Prasad, Rai, *see* Lall, Rai Hari Prasad  
 Hari Singh, 502  
 Hari Singh, Maharaja, 129, 129n  
 Haroon, Abdullah, *see* Abdullah Haroon  
 Hasrat Mohani, Maulana, 66, 66n, 76, 241-43, 526  
 Heatly, 129, 133  
 Hedgewar, K.B., 543  
 Henry IV (of Bolingbroke), 345, 345n  
*Herald*, 39  
 Hewett, John, 107  
 Hindley, Clement, 440, 440n  
*Hindu*, 71, 71n  
 Hindu Mahasabha, 98-99, 101, 531  
 Hindu-Muslim Pact, 290-91  
 Hindu Religious and Charitable Trusts Bill, 390-92  
 Hindu Sangathan, 249, 491-92  
*Hindustan Times*, *The*, 75, 75n, 113, 117, 139, 238n, 266n, 267n, 272n, 312n, 313n  
 Hira Singh, Captain, *see* Brar, Hira Singh  
*Hitavada*, *The*, 272n  
 Holsinger, F.W., 170n  
 Home Rule League, 530  
 Horniman, B.G., 30n, 59; return to India, 342-43  
 Husain, Mohamed Akbar, *see* Mohamed Akbar Husain  
 Husain Khan, *see* Khan Husain  
 Husembhoy Abdulbhoj Lalji, 500, 500n  
 Huq, Fazlul, *see* Fazlul Huq  
 Hyder, L.K., 299, 299n
- Ibrahīm, Sheikh, *see* Sheikh Ibrahim
- Ihahi Bux, 543  
*Independent*, 30, 531, 531n  
 Independent Party, 251-52, 257-58, 264, 449, 453  
 India Office, 298  
 Indian Criminal Law Amendment (Repealing) Bill, 392-98  
*Indian Daily Mail*, 170, 170n, 268  
*Indian Daily Telegraph*, *The*, 30, 30n, 31, 123  
 Indian Finance Bill, 253, 256-57, 259, 354-64, 445-55  
 Indian Fiscal Commission, 369, 426  
*Indian Hansard*, 260  
 Indian Medical Service, 374, 385  
 Indian National Congress, 14, 30-31, 51, 65, 142, 161, 188, 451, 507, 520, 523-24, 544; Report of the Thirty-seventh session at Gaya (1922), 183n; session at Cocanada, 198-204; Bal Gangadhar Tilak's speech at Calcutta session, 227; Report of the Thirty-ninth session at Belgaum, 241n, 243n, 245n; adopts programme of political work, 273-76; Motilal Nehru's views on Congress split, 281-86; special session at Delhi, 287; Motilal Nehru's speech at Cocanada session, 289-91; session at Belgaum, 509  
 Indian National Pact, 198-201  
*Indian Quarterly Register*, *The*, 141n, 543n  
 Indian Registration (Amendment) Bill, Motilal Nehru's view on, 464-65  
 Indian Sandhurst Committee, *see* Skeen Committee  
 Indian Tariff Board, 292-93  
 Indian Taxation Enquiry Committee, 89, 439  
 Indu, *see* Nehru, Indira  
 Innes, Charles Alexander, 260, 260n, 261, 364-65, 369, 422, 426-28, 430, 441; on cotton excise, 432  
*Ishidevi*, the goddess of politics of B.G. Tilak, 228  
 Iyengar, A. Rangaswami, 41, 55, 67, 178, 185, 252, 258, 262, 500, 519, 521, 544, 548  
 Iyengar, Dnraishwami, *see* Ayyangar, C. Duraiswami  
 Iyengar, S. Srinivasa, 64, 67, 163, 178, 183, 512, 544  
 Iyer, C.S., Ranga, 169, 176; made statement in press against Swaraj Party, 170  
 Iyer, G. Subramania, 71n
- Jabalpur, 150-51  
 Jagat Narain, Pandit, 20-23, 174  
 Jagjit Singh, 185, 518

- Jai Chand, Dr. Diwan, 139, 139n, 141  
 Jai Narain, Chowdhri, *see* Singh, Chowdhri  
 Jai Narain  
 Jain, Ajit Prasad, 502, 502n  
 Jain, Nemi Saran, 148, 148n  
 Jairamdas Doulatram, 108, 108n, 512, 544  
 Jalaun, 148  
 Jallianwala Bagh, Motilal Nehru's speech on its anniversary, 204-11  
 Jamnadas Dwarkadas, 281n, 508, 544  
 Jamnadas, Seth, 150, 150n, 151  
 Jamnadas, Tejpal, *see* Tejpal Jamnadas  
 Jamshedpur, 135-36  
 Jamshedpur Steel Works, 48  
 Jaswant Singh, Raja, the ruler of Lakhna estate, 127n  
 Jayakar, M.R., 12, 12n, 13, 32, 35, 44, 56, 58-60, 62, 67, 69, 103, 108-09, 146, 159, 161, 166, 170, 175, 177, 185, 228, 268, 319-20, 499, 512, 518, 522, 524, 526-27  
 Jeejani, S.A.K., 523, 523n  
 Jhabbal, Amar Singh, 198, 198n, 200  
 Jhansi, 115, 148  
 Jhaveri, Reva Shanker Jagjivan, 501, 501n  
 Jhuggulal Kamlapat, 532  
 Jilani, Makhdum Sayed Rajan Baksh Shah, 299, 299n  
 Jinnah, M.A., 90, 119, 124, 135, 152-54, 156-57, 259-61, 264, 366, 372, 395, 397, 417, 419, 443, 450, 464, 508, 512, 530; on Swaraj Party, 117, 119-20; and Independent Party, 252-54, 258; and policy of obstruction, 253-55; on Indian Finance Bill, 448  
 Jinnah, Ruttienbai (wife of M.A. Jinnah), 76, 76n  
 Jodh Singh, Bhai, 489, 489n  
 Joint Parliamentary Committee, 443-44, 450  
 Joseph, George, 129, 133, 155, 500  
 Joshi, N.M., 146, 146n, 177, 368, 512, 544  
 Jubbulpore, *see* Jabalpur  
 Juhu, 41, 63, 100  
 Kafayatullah Mufti, Maulana 496, 496n  
 Kakori Conspiracy Case, 173, 173n  
 Kale, Yadav Madhav, 522, 522n  
 Kamakshi Natarajan, 499, 499n  
 Kamlapat, Jhuggulal, *see* Jhuggulal Kamlapat  
 Kanitkar, Ramchandra Anant, 522, 522n  
 Kanpur, 84, 104, 129, 148, 169, 179, Motilal Nehru's reply to an address by Kanpur Municipality, 191-92; Motilal Nehru's speech regarding Government's statement on electoral disqualification, 271-72; Motilal Nehru's speech on the site chosen for Congress session, 272; Report of the Fortieth session of Congress, 272n, 276n; Motilal Nehru's speech at Congress session, 276-77  
 Kantilal Gokuldas, *see* Parekh, Kantilal Gokuldas  
 Kasturbhai Lalbhai, 109, 109n, 113, 161, 261, 264, 431, 434  
 Kasuri, Maulana Abdul Qadir, 185, 185n, 518  
 Kathalay, D.W., 543  
 Katju, Kailash Nath, 150-51  
 Kelkar, N.C., 79, 122, 159-60, 167, 171, 175, 177, 179, 185, 224, 252, 258, 268-69, 430, 495, 500, 508, 512, 518, 520, 526  
 Kerr, John Henry, 439, 439n  
 Kesari, 226  
 Keshav Chandra Singh, *see* Chaudhry, Keshav Chandra Singh  
 Khaddar, 3, 65, 68, 72, 114, 152, 160-61, 211, 217, 221-22, 243, 274, 283, 303, 509, 512-13, 515-17, 535, 537-38  
 Khaatun, Debi Prasad, 150, 150n  
 Khalique, A., 543  
 Khaliqzaman, Choudhry, 122, 125, 147, 156, 499  
 Khan, Abdur Rashid (of Bengal), 523, 523n  
 Khan, Abdur Rashid (of Ambala), 517, 517n  
 Khan, Aga, *see* Aga Khan  
 Khan, Bismillah, 543  
 Khan, Hakim Ajmal, 14, 17, 172, 184, 187, 289, 487-88, 491, 495, 495n, 497, 518, 520  
 Khan, Husain, 543  
 Khan, Kunwar Abdul Wahab, 491  
 Khan, Mohamed Kasem, 543  
 Khan, Mohammad Ismail, 164, 164n  
 Khan, Mohammad Yamin, 115, 115n  
 Khan, R., 543  
 Khan, Raja Ghazanfar Ali, 299, 299n  
 Khan, Shaikh Moazzam Ali, 187, 187n, 499  
 Khan, Syed Ahmed, 532  
 Khan, Yusuf, 543  
 Khare, N.B., 528, 528n, 543  
 Khatri, Ahmed Haji Siddiq, 500, 500n  
 Khatri, Pamandas Sugnomal, 517, 517n  
 Khazan Singh, 488  
 Khedutona Pita, *see* Parekh, Gokuldas Khandas  
 Kher, Atmaram Govind, 148, 148n  
 Khilafat, 286, 286n  
 Khwaja, Abdul Majid, 8, 8n, 115, 503  
 Kidwai, Rafi Ahmed, 51, 51n, 71, 152, 174, 523  
 Kidwai, Shaikh Mushir Husain, 121, 121n  
 Kitchlew, Saifuddin, 498

- Knight, Robert, 62n, 77n  
 Kohat Riots, 243, 243n, 244-45  
 Kona Dacoity and Murder Case, 399, 399n, 438  
 Kothari, Manilal V., 502  
 Kowjalg, Srinivas Venkatesh, 29, 29n  
 Kumaun, 115  
 Kunwar Abdul Wahab Khan, *see* Khan, Kunwar Abdul Wahab  
 Kunzru, Hirday Nath, 43-44, 544  
 Ladli, *see* Zutshi. Ladli Prasad  
 Lahore, 42, 133-34, 141  
 Lajpat Rai, Lajpat, 40, 53, 59, 75n, 100, 108, 200, 237, 239, 291, 444, 496, 512, 531-32, 544; ill at Solan, 153  
 Lakhna Case, 127, 127n  
 Lakshmi Narayana, V., *see* Unnava, Lakshminarayana  
 Lal Mohamed, 543  
 Lalbhai, Kasturbhai, *see* Kasturbhai Lalbhai  
 Lalji, Husseinbhojy Abdulbhojy, *see* Husseinbhojy Abdulbhojy Lalji  
 Lalji Narajji, 58, 58n, 59, 61-62, 70, 78, 87, 103, 109-10, 113-14, 116, 119, 160-61, 167; donation for Swaraj Party, 81-82  
 Lall, Rai Hari Prasad, 184, 184n, 518  
 Lalubhai Samaldas, *see* Mehta, Lalubhai Samaldas  
 Lambton, John George, 451n, 469, 469n  
 Lausanne, 188-89  
 Leader, *The*, 17n, 18, 18n, 19, 20, 20n, 22, 24n, 30n, 39, 41, 48, 184n, 186n, 187n, 189, 238n, 239n, 248n, 251n, 254n, 261n, 281n, 286n, 287n, 288n, 291n, 293n, 295n, 306n, 309n, 310n, 496, 503n, 508n  
 Lee Commission (1923), 74, 74n, 305, 427-28, 439, 455, recommendations of, 373-90  
 Lee, Lord (of Fareham), 74n  
 Legislative Assembly (President's Salary) Bill, 414-15, 417-18  
 Liberal Federation, 90  
 Liberal Party, 549  
 Liberty, *see also* Forward Liberty, 33n  
 Lincoln, Abraham, 209, 209n, 339  
 Lohokare, K. G., 352  
 Lona Sath Masjid, 543  
 London Times, 531  
 Lotan Singh, 139, 139n  
 Lotvala, Ranchoddas Bhavan, 167, 167n  
 Lowell, Abbott Lawrence, 381, 381n  
 Lucknow, 29, 116, 169, 177, Motilal Nehru's reply to an address by Municipal Board, 189-91; Motilal Nehru's speech on the question of United Congress, 270-71  
 Lucknow Hospital, 176-77  
 Lumby, Major, 156-57  
 Lyallpuri, Master Sunder Singh, *see* Sunder Singh, Master  
 Lytton, Lord, 143n, 297-99, 399, 438, 549, and Char Manair Case, 238; Das-Lytton negotiations, 313-18  
 Macaulay, Thomas Babington, 472, 472n  
 Mac Donald, James Ramsay, 209  
 Madani, Maulana Husain Ahmad, 497, 497n  
 Madho Rao, 160  
 Madras Mail, 386  
 Magh Sankranti, 5  
 Maha Laxmi Bai, Beti, 23, 23n  
 Mahasu, 157  
 Mahmud, Syed, *see* Syed Mahmud  
 Mahmudabad, Raja of, 116  
 Maharashtra, *The*, 112, 112n  
 Mahtab, Buay Chand, 43, 43n  
 Malabar, 489  
 Malaviya, Kapildeva, 24, 184, 502, 502n, 518, 520  
 Malaviya, Krishnakant, 27  
 Malaviya, Madan Mohan, 18n, 75, 98, 153, 200, 204, 207, 252, 254-58, 276-77, 328, 330, 335, 357, 361-63, 418-19, 434, 447, 496, 508, 530-31; on constitutional aspect, 453-54  
 Malihabad, 30  
 Malkana Rajputs, 487, 491-92  
 Man Singh, Raja, 471  
 Mandlik, R. N., 522, 522n  
 Manekji Dadabhai, 151  
 Mangal Singh, 544  
 Manmohan Das Ramji, *see* Vora, Manmohan Das Ramji  
 Mansukhani, J. T., *see* Govindanand, Swami  
 Maulana, Abdul Arif, *see* Abdul Arif, Maulana  
 Maulana Abdul Bari, *see* Abdul Bari, Maulana  
 Maulana Abdul Halim Siddiq, *see* Siddiq, Maulana Abdul Halim  
 Maulana Abdul Majid, *see* Abdul Majid, Maulana  
 Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, *see* Azad, Maulana Abul Kalam  
 Maulana Ahmed Saeed, *see* Ahmed Saeed, Maulana  
 Maulana Azad Sobhani, *see* Sobhani, Maulana Azad  
 Maulana Habibur Rahman, *see* Habibur Rahman, Maulana

- Maulana Hasrat Mohani, *see* Hasrat Mohani, Maulana
- Maulana Husain Ahmad Madani, *see* Madani, Maulana Husain Ahmad
- Maulana Kafayatullah Mufti, *see* Kafayatullah Mufti, Maulana
- Maulana Masud Ali Nadvi, *see* Nadvi, Maulana Masud Ali
- Maulana Mazharuddin, *see* Mazharuddin, Maulana
- Maulana Mohamed Ali, *see* Mohamed Ali, Maulana
- Maulana Mohamed Naim, *see* Mohamed Naim, Maulana
- Maulana Mohamed Sajjad, *see* Mohamed Sajjad, Maulana
- Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani, *see* Usmani, Maulana Shabbir Ahmad
- Maulana Shaukat Ali, *see* Shaukat Ali, Maulana
- Maulana, Umar Daraz Beg, *see* Beg, Maulana Umar Daraz
- Maulvi Abul Kasem, *see* Abul Kasem, Maulvi
- Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi, *see* Daoodi, Maulvi Muhammad Shafee
- Mazharuddin, Maulana, 500, 500n
- Meerut, 115
- Mehra, Jivraj Narayan, 106, 106n
- Mehra, Lalubhai Samaldas, 116-17, 117n
- Mehra, Pherozeshah, 30n
- Mehtab Singh, Sardar Bahadur, 198, 198n, 199-200, 488
- Meston, Lord, 444
- Mian Abdul Aziz, *see* Abdul Aziz, Mian
- Mian Mohamed Chotani, *see* Chotani, Haji
- Mian Mohamed
- Military College (Dehra Dun), 154, Motilal Nehru's views regarding establishment of, 418-21
- Minto, Lord, 407
- Mishra, Gauri Shankar, 71, 156, 501, 501n
- Misra, Harkaran Nath, 5, 184, 501, 501n, 518
- Misra, Kunwar Ganpat Gopal, 23n
- Misra, Pandit Brijnandan Prasad, 148, 148n
- Misra, Pandit Gokaran Nath, 31
- Mitra, Krishna Kumar, 406, 406n
- Mitra, Satyendra Chandra, 54, 54n, 55, 230, 523
- Mirzapur Street Bomb Case, 402, 402n
- Mozzam Ali, *see* Khan, Shaikh Moazzam Ali
- Mohamed Akbar Husain, 543
- Mohamed Ali, Maulana, 51-52, 57, 61, 76, 83, 86n, 87, 90, 142, 157-58, 243, 305-06, 341, 497, 511, 544, 549
- Mohamed Ali, Munshi, 543
- Mohamed Alim, 543
- Mohamed Amir, 543
- Mohamed Husain, 543
- Mohamed Naim, Maulana, 502, 502n
- Mohamed Sajjad, Maulana, 497, 497n
- Mohamed Tahir, 543
- Mohammad Yakub, 125, 125n, 126, 264, 324, 512
- Mohammad Yusuf Shareef, 105, 105n, 542-43
- Moharram, 59
- Montagu, Edwin, 337, 450
- Mookerji, Radhakumud, 142, 142n, 143, 550
- Moonje, B.S., 67, 99, 105, 150-51, 177, 185, 508, 511, 524, 528, 543
- Morarjee, Narottam, 87, 87n, 114
- Morley, Lord, 407-08
- Moti Singh, Thakur, 94, 94n, 95-96
- Motichand, Raja, 38
- Motwani, Arjandas Sakharimal, 518, 518n
- Muddiman, Alexander Phillips, 123, 123n, 374, 449
- Muddiman Committee, 313, 476, 479, 481
- Mufti, Maulana Kafayatullah, *see* Kafayatullah Mufti, Maulana
- Mujaddid, Pir Ghulam, 498, 498n
- Muhammad Rafique, Syed, 5, 3n
- Muhammad Sulaiman, Shah, 4, 4n
- Muhammad Taqi, 501, 501n
- Muhammad Yakub, *see* Mohammad Yakub
- Muhi Uddin, 543
- Muir, Ramsay, 380, 380n
- Mukadam, Waman Sitaram, 3, 3n
- Mukerji, Radha Kumud, *see* Mookerji Radhakumud
- Mullick, Dr. Madho Lal, 157, 157n
- Multan, 400
- Murtuza, S., 523
- Mushran, Shamsi, 42, 152
- Muslim League, 90, 101, 542
- Muslim Tanzeem, 249
- Mustapha Kemal Pasha, *see* Pasha, Mustapha Kemal
- Nabha, 24, 117-18, 154, 157, Maharaja of, 30n, 154, 154n, 156, 158
- Nadvi, Maulana Masud Ali, 148, 148n, 498
- Nadvi, Maulana Saiyed Sulaiman, 498, 498n
- Nagar Seth, *see* Bajaj, Seth Rameshwar Das
- Nagpur, 102, 114, 166, 168-72, 174, 268, 320, 438, 535, 540-41; Motilal Nehru's

- speech on Hindu-Muslim settlement at, 248n; joint statement by Abul Kalam Azad and Motilal Nehru on Hindu-Muslim dispute at, 510-11; meeting of the Executive Committee of Swaraj Party at, 526-28; Hindu-Muslim accord at, 542-43
- Naidu, Coya Venkatarangam, 522, 522n
- Naidu, K.V.R. Swami, 186, 186n, 519
- Naidu, Sarojini, 42, 42n, 49, 64, 67, 153-54, 175, 177, 187, 487-88, 490, 495, 500, 500n, 508, 513
- Naimtal, 149
- Nair, Sankaran, 100
- Nan, see Pandit, Vijaya Lakshmi
- Nand Kishore, 134
- Naranji, Lalji, see Lalji Naranji
- Narendra Nath, Raja, 129, 488
- Nariman, K.F., 175-76, 533
- Narangh Rao, Rao, 126, 126n
- Natarajan, Kamakshi, see Kamakshi Natarajan
- Natesan, G.A., 508
- Nationalist Party, 41, 93, 97, 253-55, 257-59, 291, 360, 438; and Demands for Grants, 353-54
- Nehru, Brajlal, 129
- Nehru, Indira, 3, 24, 43, 74, 106, 129, 134, 153, 158, 174
- Nehru, Jawaharlal, 4, 8n, 9, 28-29, 42, 43, 49, 51, 70, 72-74, 104, 106, 114-15, 124, 128, 131, 133, 137, 140, 143-44, 149, 152-153, 155-56, 174-77, 444, 511, 513, 527, 544
- Nehru, Kamla, 5, 24, 42-43, 106, 124, 129, 134, 156-57, 174; treatment of, 175-79
- Nehru, Krishna, 5, 106, 129, 132-34, 154-55
- Nehru, Motilal, on *Charkha*, 3, 223, on *Khaddar*, 3, 72, 160-61, 211, 221-22, 283, 303, at Rambagh (Allahabad), 4-5, attended a meeting of the shareholders of Nationalist Journals Ltd., 5; on programme and policy of Swaraj Party, 9-12, 64-66, 230, 288-89, on work of Swaraj Party, 14-15, 110, 112, 116, 125, 142-44, 160, 163, on communal differences in Punjab, 15, on categorisation of the members of A.I.C.C., 15-16, on Council-entry, 15-17, 20, 36, 45, 51-52, 192, 217-22, 304-07, on Hindu-Muslim unity, 18-19, 65, 68, 76, 81, 102, 122, 188-89, 199-203, 239-40, 306-09, speech at Lucknow, 18-20; on Liberal Party, 19-20, speech at Lahore, 20, and Govt. order concerning the presentation of address by local bodies, 20-22; and Barclay National School, 23; Nabha visit, 24, regarding conviction of 3 January 1922, 27-28; and Karnatak Provincial Conference, 29; on "An open letter" by 'Recluse', 30-32 and Swaraj Party meeting at Cocanada, 32, 521-26; Swaraj Party circular, 32-33; at Western Hostel, Raisina (Delhi), 37; on National Demand, 37-39, on Finance Bill, 39-40, 207-08, 256-57, 354-64, 445-55; on working of the Govt. of India Act (1919), 41-42, tour programme of, 42, 45, 141; on Taxation Committee, 43; on the upkeep of Anand Bhawan, 43; on agenda of Swaraj Party, 44-45, 54-55, 96, questions submitted to Maulana Mohamed Ali, 51-57; on the nomination of Chief Editor of *Bombay Chronicle*, 56, 59, 61; on Mahatma Gandhi's health, 57-58; on article "Raising the Wind", published in the *Times of India*, 62-64; on donations/funds for Swaraj Party, 63, 81-82, 91, 109-10, 113-14, 116, 160-61, 163-64, 168; on changes in the Congress Constitution, 68; and *Bombay Chronicle*, 70, on status of Swaraj Party in Congress, 79; on nature of franchise, 79-80, urged Liberal Federation and Muslim League to hold their sessions at Belgaum, 90, on cattle slaughter, 97-98, and All Parties Conference, 100-01, 103, 304-06, 309-10, broke journey at Kanpur owing to ill-health, 104; met Sir John Hewett, 107; on the death of Diwan Bahadur Seth Ballabh Das, 111-12; and ethics of moustaches, 115, on Shahidi Jatha, 117-18; went to Dalhousie owing to ill-health, 126-30, and *Lakhna Case*, 127, 127n; asks Jawaharlal Nehru and others to come to Dalhousie, 132; invited Mahatma Gandhi to Dalhousie, 136; on C.R. Das's death, 138, 141; ill-health of, 139, 287, 312; and Sken Committee, 140; 152, 152n, 153-57, 175, 268-69, 312-13; Radhakumud Mookerji's criticism of C.R. Das, 142-43, and Fazlul Haq, 143-44, on Municipal and District Board Elections, (U.P.), 147-49, on elections in C.P., 150-51; Karlash Nath Katju's election manifesto, 151-52; on Swaraj Party's Presidential election, 153-54; on starting a weekly from Allahabad, 160, 167; on Independents, 165; on meaning of Swaraj, 165; on meeting of the Executive Committee of Swaraj Party at Nagpur, 166-67, 171; on abdication of Ripudaman Singh, Maharaja of Nabha, 158-59, 168-69, disciplinary action against C.S. Ranga Iyer, 169-70; and funds for the defence of Kakori pri-



soners, 173-74; and Kamla Nehru's treatment, 175-79, object of visit to Poona, 177-78, Council-entry resolution at Gaya, 183, 183n; congratulates Congressmen on election results in Municipal and District Boards, 187; suggests line of action to Congressmen in polling centres, 187; reply to an address by the Municipal Board, Lucknow, 189-91, presented with a silver *pandan* by the Municipal Board, Lucknow, 190n; reply to an address by the Kanpur Municipality, 191-92; on position of Swaraj Party in relation to Congress, 192; on Election Manifesto of Swaraj Party 192-97, 231-32; on Indian National Pact and Bengal National Pact, 198-201; resolution at Cocanada Congress, 198-201; speeches at Cocanada Congress, 198-204; on achievements of Swaraj Party, 204-11; expresses gratitude to the members of Nationalist Party, 205; on Labour Party and Labour Government, 209-10, on Dr. Hari Singh Gour forming a new party, 210, and non-Swarajist members, 210, criticises Government of India Act (1919), 211-17; and adult franchise, 212, and C.P. Settlement Bill, 215; on principal object of Swaraj Party, 215-16, and non-violence, 217-18, differences with Mahatma Gandhi, 217-19, and non-cooperation, 218; on constructive programme, 220, 223; and policy of obstruction, 220; on Khilafat and Punjab causes, 221; speech at A.I.C.C. meeting in Ahmedabad on Gandhi's Resolution, (1924), 223; speech at unveiling ceremony of Tilak's statue, 223-30, on two lobbies in Assembly, 232, on absurdities of rules, 232-33; on beginning of cooperation, 233, on Constitution and financial position of Swaraj Party, 234-36; on election funds, 235; charged for making money on false grounds, 236; reply to an address by Calcutta Corporation, 236-37, on Calcutta Corporation's weakness, 237, on breaking of fast by Mahatma Gandhi, 238; speeches at Belgaum session of Congress, 241-45, on Kohat and Gulbarga riots, 243, 243n, 244-45; vote of thanks to Mahatma Gandhi at Belgaum Congress, 245-46; on repressive policy of Government, 246-47; speech after settlement of Hindu-Muslim dispute at Nagpur, 248-50; instructions to Swaraj Party office bearers, 250-51; on various political parties in the Assembly and their work, 251-65; questions to M.A.

Jinnah regarding policy of obstruction, 253-54; on Railway Board, 259, 261; and political sagacity, 261; on debt redemption, 262-63; speech at Sitapur regarding crisis in Swaraj Party, 267-70, refusal to become member of Muddiman Committee, 268; speech in Lucknow on question of United Congress, 270-71; speech in Kanpur regarding Government's statement on electoral disqualification, 271-72; on national flag, 272; issued appeal to C.P. electors of the Council of State, 272-73; speech at Congress session, Kanpur, 276-77; bulletin regarding meeting of the Congress-Khilafat-Swaraj Party, 281; views on Congress split, 281-86, 294-95; on attitude of Swaraj Party in case of war, 285; on Congress resolution repudiating public debt, 285; on Malikana Rajputs, 286; on political offenders and non-cooperators, 286-87, and employment in Japan, 288; and Bengal Draft of the Hindu-Muslim Pact, 290-91; comments on interview with Mahatma Gandhi, 291; and nationalisation of steel industry, 291-93; and Indian Tariff Board's report, 292-93, on Mahatma Gandhi and truthfulness, 294; on Gopinath Saha, 295-96; on abolition of anarchism, 296, on Bengal Ordinance, 296-303; on Lord Reading's declaration, 297; on Subhas Chandra Bose, 299, on effects of Calcutta agreement on various political parties, 301-02; invitation for Bombay Conference, 303-04; on a United Congress at Belgaum, 305-06; on role of Panchayat Boards, 306-08, on spinning franchise, 308; on inter-communal institutions, 309, on Swaraj Party versus Government offices, 309-10; comments on Lord Birkenhead's speech, 310-11, on Das-Lytton negotiations, 313-18, on Tambre's appointment to Governor's Executive Council, 318-20; on V.J. Patel as President of the Assembly, 319-20; on Dominion Status, 323-40; on Civil Disobedience Inquiry Committee Report, 330-31, on Baring's 'Russia', 334; and Assembly greetings to Labour Party on its advent to power, 338-39, on Muhammadan representation, 340-42; on List of Demands in the Budget, 344-53, 431-45; on G.M. Bhurgr's death, 353; on Nationalist Party in regard to Demands for Grants, 353-54, on abolition of cotton excise, 364-65; on Steel Industry (Protec-

- Prakasam, T., 71n, 163, 163n, 499  
 Pratap Singh, 158, 158n, 159  
 Pratap Sitaram, *see* Pandit, Pratap Sitaram  
 Prevention of Seditious Meeting Act, (1907), 22, 22n, (1911), 22n  
*Punjab Reconciliation Board*, 494-95  
 Purandare, Dr. N.A., 91, 91n  
 Purshotamdas Thakurdas, 58, 58n, 77, 81, 84, 86, 91, 93, 97-98, 103, 109, 113, 119, 135, 138, 162, 172, 179, 256, 263-64, 299, 413, 427, 432, 446-47, 451, 508  
 Raghavendra Rao, E., 67, 67n, 150, 168, 185, 518, 523, 526, 528  
 Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan, *see* Khan, Raja Ghazanfar Ali  
 Rajagopalachari, C., 14, 31, 110, 187, 283, 498, 520  
 Rajagopalachari, C.V., 6, 6n, 515-17  
 Rajendra Prasad, 498  
 Rajkot, 42-44, 106  
 Rama, Pandit Jagat Mohan Nath, 23n  
 Raju, Venkatapathi, *see* Venkatapathi Raju, Bhupatiraju  
 Ram Ashram, Swami, *see* Sinha, Ram Chandra  
 Ram Bagh (Allahabad), 4-5  
 Ramachandra Rao, Dewan Bahadur M., 152, 152n, 252-58, 464, 508, 544, 548  
 Ramadas, V., *see* Pantulu, V. Ramadas  
 Rameshwar Singh, 38  
 Ramlal, Dewan, 123, 123n  
 Ramseshan, 160  
*Ranade, Mahadev Govind*, 229  
 Rangachariar, Dewan Bahadur T., 153, 153n, 154, 252-54, 258, 264, 299, 323-25, 332, 339, 348, 355, 359, 414, 419, 422, 440, 464, 508, 544, 548  
 Rani Kishori, 126, 126n, 127n  
 Ranjit Singh, Chaudhary, 4n  
 Raw, Dr. Raghvendra, *see* Row, Dr. Raghvendra  
 Ray, Prafulla Chandra, 513, 513n  
 Raza Ali, 115  
 Reading, Lord, 271, 297-98, 476  
 Red Bengal Society, 394  
 Reddy, C.R., 101, 101n  
*Reforms Inquiry Committee*, 438-39, 441-43, 445; Recommendations of, 466-83  
 Regulation III (1818), 298, 401, 406-07, 438  
 Report on the Affairs of British North America (1839), *see* Durham Report  
 Repressive Laws Committee (1921), 22n  
 Rhodes, Campbell Ward, 414, 414n, 415, 440  
 Richard II, 345  
 Richards, Robert, 212, 212n, 213, 358  
 Ripudaman Singh, *see* Nabha, Maharaja of  
 Rohatgi, Jawaharlal, 34, 84, 84n, 104, 148  
 Rohilkhand, 115  
 Row, Dr. Raghvendra, 178, 178n, 179  
*Rowlatt Act (1919)*, 349  
 Roy, Bidhan Chandra, 144, 144n, 514  
 Roy, K.C., 208, 362-63  
 Roy, Manabendra Nath, 409, 409n, 410  
 Roy, Prafulla Chandra, *see* Ray, Prafulla Chandra  
 Royal Army Medical Corps (India), 374  
 Royal Commission on Superior Civil Services in India, 373-90  
 Sabarmati, 46, 58  
 Sadar Masjid, 543  
 Saha, Gopinath, 295, 295n  
 Saharanpur, 4, 4n  
 Sahay, Chandrabansi, 184, 184n, 518  
 Sahay, Krishna Ballabh, 145, 145n, 173  
 Sahni, Ruchi Ram, 185, 500, 517-18, 520  
 Saksena, Jiyaram, 94, 94n, 147  
 Saksena, Mohanlal, 74, 74n, 94-95, 539  
 Salempur, Raja of, *see* Alvi, Ahmad Ali Khan  
 Samundri, Teja Singh, 502, 502n  
 Sandhurst, 419-20  
 Sankarotla Murder Case, 297, 297n, 401  
 Santanam, K., 42, 488, 498  
 Sapru, Manohar Nath, 23, 23n  
 Sapru, Tej Bahadur, 443, 508  
 Sarkar, Nilratan, 514, 514n  
 Sarker, Natini Ranjan, 316, 316n, 514  
 Sarma, Lakshmidhar, 517, 517n  
 Sasmal, B.N., 184, 518  
 Sastri, V.S. Srinivasa, *see* Srinivasa Sastri, V.S.  
 Satyadeva, Swami, 532  
 Satyamurti, S., 105, 105n, 185, 517, 519, 522, 544  
 Satyapal, Dr., 497  
 Saxena, Jiyaram, *see* Saksena, Jiyaram  
 Saxena, Mohanlal, *see* Saksena, Mohanlal  
 Scurr, John, 212, 212n, 404  
 Selborne, W.W.F., 478, 478n  
 Sen-Gupta, Jatindra Mohan, 67, 67n, 143, 145, 164, 513  
 Serajgauj, 295  
 Setalvad, Chamanlal, 392, 465-66  
 Sethi, Gurudutt, 136, 136n  
 Sethna, Pheroze, 156, 156n, 157  
 Shah, Damodar Das, 148, 148n  
 Shah Muhammad Sulaiman, *see* Muhammad Sulaiman, Shah  
 Shahidi Jatha, 117-18

- Shaikh Moazzam Ali Khan, *see* Khan,  
 Shaikh Moazzam Ali  
 Shaikh Mushir Husain Kidwai, *see*  
 Kidwai, Shaikh Mushir Husain  
 Sham Sunder, 137  
 Shanichar Masjid, 543  
 Shankar Dayal, Rai Bahadur, 98, 98n, 539  
 Sharceef, M.Y., *see* Mohammad Yusuf  
 Shareef  
 Sharma, Dev Rattan, 503, 503n  
 Sharma, Din Dayalu, 497, 497n  
 Sharma, Mauli Chandra, 502, 502n  
 Sharma, Neki Ram, 497, 497n  
 Shaikat Ali, Maulana, 51-52, 61, 511, 513,  
 544  
 Sheikh Ibrahim, 543  
 Sher Singh, Giani, 502, 502n  
 Sherwanl, A.S., 500  
 Sherwanl, Tasadduq Ahmad Khan, 67, 67n,  
 116, 149, 187, 520, 522  
 Shinde, B.H., 543  
 Shiromani Gurdwara Parbandhak Com-  
 mittee, 117-18, 488, 493  
 Shiva Rao, B., 544, 548  
 Shivaji Festival, 226  
 Shraddhanand, Swami, 491, 497, 511  
 Shuddhi Movement, 491-92  
 Shukla, R., 168  
 Siddiq, Maulana Abdul Hafim, 498  
 Siddiqi, Kutubuddin, 286n  
 Siddiqui, Abdur Rahman, 106, 106n  
 Siddiqui, M.A., 543  
 Sidgwick, Henry, 380, 380n  
 Sidhwa, R.K., 309, 309n, 522  
 Sim, George Gall, 424, 424n  
 Simla, 42, 46, 48, 56, 66, 69-70, 76-78, 81,  
 146, 151, 157, 168, 534, 549  
 Simpson, John Hope, 212, 212n  
 Sind, 166  
 Singh, Chowdhri Jai Narain, 94, 94n, 95-96,  
 539  
 Singh, Deep Narayan, 71  
 Singh, Maharaja Bahadur Keshav Prasad,  
 38, 38n  
 Singh, Thakur Har Prasad, 148, 148n  
 Singh, Thakur Suraj Nath, 149, 149n  
 Singhania, Kamalpat, 34, 34n, 532  
 Singhania, Lala Padampat, 34n  
 Sinha, Devaki Prasad, 76, 76n, 363, 368  
 Sinha, Ram Chandra, 31, 31n  
 Sinha, Sachchidananda, 471  
 Sinn Fein (Ourselves Alone), 36, 36n  
 Sita Ram, 6-7, 7n, 98  
 Sitapur, 169-71; Motilal Nehru's speech at,  
 267-70  
 Skeen, Andrew, 152n  
 Skeen Committee (1925), 152, 152n, 153-  
 57, 175, 268-69, 312-13  
 Sly, Frank, 439  
 Smith, Henry Moncrieff, 88, 88n, 358, 363  
 Sobhani, Maulana Azad, 241, 241n, 242,  
 498  
 Sobhani, Osman, 58, 58n, 61, 70, 103, 503,  
 503n  
 Sobhani, Umar, 58, 58n, 61, 70, 82, 103,  
 500  
 Sodhi, Parmeshwar, 129, 129n, 132  
 Solan (Simla), 42, 153-54  
 Sondhi, Lal Devi (wife of Razada Hansraj),  
 129, 129n  
 Special Laws Repeal Bill, 454  
 Spoor, Ben, 39  
 Sprawson, Cuthbert Allan, 179, 179n  
 Sri Prakasa, 148  
 Srinivasa Sastri, V.S., 508, 530  
 Stanyon, Henry John, 414, 414n, 416-17  
 Statesman, *The*, 77, 77n  
 Steel Industry (Protection) Bill, 120, 233;  
 Motilal Nehru's views on, 366-73  
 Stephenson, Hugh L., 406, 406n  
 Sukhbir Singh, Lala, 38  
 Sukhrmdas, *see* Tanwermalani, Sukhrm-  
 das Tulsidas  
 Sunder Singh, Master, 502, 502n  
 Sunder Singh, Sardar, 503, 503n  
 Supreme Court, Motilal Nehru's views on,  
 416-17  
 Svadesamitran, 56, 56n  
 Swami, K.V.R., *see* Naidu, K.V.R. Swami  
 Swaraj Party, 13-14, 25, 27, 31, 43, 63, 68-  
 69, 84, 86, 123, 160, 474, 481-82; pro-  
 gramme and policy of, 9-12, 64-66, 142-  
 44, 230; formed and constituted at, 10;  
 Council-entry, 15-17, 36-37, 51-52, 192,  
 217-22, 535-36, agenda of business, 33, 44;  
 in different provinces, 35-37, 110, Nation-  
 al Demand, 37-38, 206; agenda of the  
 General Meeting at Calcutta, 54-55; sta-  
 tus in the Congress, 79; donations/funds  
 for, 81-82, 91, 109-10, 113-14, 116, 160-61,  
 168, 519; Mahatma Gandhi's views on,  
 87, agenda of Belgaum meeting, 96; cattle  
 slaughter issue, 97-98; work in C.P., 112,  
 144, 220, 249; attack by M.A. Jinnah,  
 117, 119-20; Mushir Husain Kidwai's  
 candidature for Presidency, 121-25;  
 work in Bengal, 144; Presidential elec-  
 tion, 153-54; financial position of, 163-64;  
 Executive Committee of the General  
 Council at Nagpur, 116-67, 171, 526-28;  
 idea of Swarajist Weekly by Motilal  
 Nehru, 167; statement by C.S. Ranga

Iyer against the Party in press, 170, Motilal Nehru's speech on Council-entry resolution, 183; list of organisers in different provinces, 184-86; Constitution of, 188, 319-20, Election Manifesto of, 192-97, 231-32; and British rule in India, 193, and non-cooperation movement, 193-94, 535-38; immediate objective of, 194; and policy of obstruction, 195-96, 253-55, 505; and the agriculturist, 196-97; notice regarding meeting of General Council at Gandhinagar, 198, achievements of, 204-11; principal object of, 215-216, some proposals by Motilal Nehru for Council-entry, 222, Motilal Nehru's speech at Party Conference, Calcutta, 231-26; constitution and financial position of, 234-36, and election funds, 235; appeal to country by Motilal Nehru, 246-47; a note for U.P., 250; crisis in, 267-70; programme of political work, 274-75; and civil disobedience movement, 234, and funds from Tatas, 292-93; and Bengal Ordinance, 298-303; work in Councils, 302; Party versus Government offices, 309-10; meeting of the General Council, 320; and Assembly's greetings to Labour Party on its advent to power, 318-39; and the question of disqualification on the ground of conviction, 443, attitude in regard to Bengal Criminal Law Amendment (Supplementary) Bill, 455-57, farewell to retiring President, (Assembly), V.J. Patel, 461-62, Party Leaders' statement, 495-96; statement on Council-entry by C.R. Das and Motilal Nehru, 504-07, programme of action within the legislative bodies, 506-07, programme of action outside the legislative bodies, 507, meeting at Allahabad, 517-20; resolutions at Allahabad meeting, 518-20; meeting at Cocanada, 521-26; resolutions at Nagpur, 527-28; and Rent Bills in Bombay Council, 533-34; resolutions of, 541-42; Swaraj Sub-Committee, Report of, 543-48

*Swaraja*, 71, 71n

Syed Fazlur Rahman, *see* Fazlur Rahman, Syed

Syed Mahmud, 114-15, 187, 499, 520, 542

Syed Muhammad Rafique, *see* Muhammad Rafique, Syed

Tagore, Rabindranath, 513

Tambe, S.B., 166, 168, 171, 267, 270, 528; appointment to Governor's Executive Council, 318-20

Tandon, Purushottam Das, 498

Tanwermalani, Sukhramdas Tulsidas, 185, 185n

Tara Singh, Master, 117, 117n, 118

Tariff Bill, 233

Tariff Committee, 354-55

Taswell-Langmead, Thomas Pitts, 345, 345n

Tata Construction Company, 367-68

Tata, Rattanjy Dadabhai, 45, 45n, 48, 50, 78, 84, 86, 98, 135-36, 174, 178-79, 366

Taxation Enquiry Committee, substitution of Economic for, 395-96

Tejpal Jannadas, 34, 34n, 532

Tikka Sahab, *see* Pratap Singh

Tilak, Bal Gangadhar, 237; unveiling ceremony of the statue of, 223-30, and politics, 225-26, 229-30; and Congress, 226-27; and Shivaji Festival, 226-27; and four-fold programme, 227; and 'waraj', 227; speech at Calcutta Congress, 227; fore-runner of Mahatma Gandhi, 227-28; and social reform, 229; on meaning of Swaraj, 228-29, on religion, 228-29

Tilak Swaraj Fund, 222

*Times of India*, *The*, 62, 62n, 63, 236, 382, 387

Thackersey, Vithaldas D., 427, 427n

Thakurdas, Purshotamdas, *see* Purshotamdas Thakurdas

Thorne, T.H., 164, 164n

Thulal, Manhattan Nath, 33, 33n

Tonkinson, Harry, 396, 396n, 397

Tribeni, 5

*Tribune*, *The*, 286n, 487n, 495

Turkish Peace Celebrations, Motilal Nehru's message on, 188-89

Tyabji, Abbaa, 499

Ultadanga Post Office Case, 400, 400n

Umreth, 166

Unity Conference (Delhi), 77, 98, 238, 245, 510

Unnava, Lakshminarayana, 186, 186n, 519

Upadhyaya, S.D., 106, 106n, 128, 174

Usmani, Maulana Shatbir Ahmad, 497, 497n

Vaidya, K.P., 543

Venkatapathiraju, Bhupatiraju, 256, 256n, 264

Venkatappayya, Konda, 498

Venkatram, 61

Vernacular Press Act (1878), 26n

Vidyarthi, Ganesh Shanker, 148

Vidyavachaspati, Indra, 185, 185n, 518

Vijayaraghavachariar, C., 165

Vincent, William Henry Hoare, 439, 439n

- Viraraghavachari, M., 71n  
 Virumal Begraj, 498, 498n  
 Visvesvaraya, M., 424, 424n  
 Vivekananda, Swami, 30n  
*Voice of India*, 18, 18n, 48, 71  
 Vora, Manmohandas Ramji, 109, 109n, 110, 119, 162  
  
 Wadia, 109-10, 113-14  
 Wagh, Vinayak Venkatrao, 225, 225n  
 Wales, Prince of, 22, 22n, 216, 221, 226  
 Walli, Hakim Abdul, 96, 96n  
 'Wayfarer', 313-14, 316  
 Wedgwood, Colonel Josiah Clement, 39-40  
 Wheeler, Henry, 439, 439n  
 Whyte, Alexander Frederick, 462, 462n  
 Wilson, W.S.J., 364, 364n  
  
 Winterton, Earl, 213, 404  
 Women's Indian Association, 530  
 World Dairy Congress, 531  
  
 Yakub Hasan, 202, 500, 500n  
 Yakub, Mo'ammad, *see* Mohammad Yakub  
*Young India*, 239, 281, 281n, 286, 291  
 Yusuf Inana, 147, 147n  
 Yusuf Khan, *see* Khan, Yusuf  
 Yusuf Shareef, Mohammad, *see* Mohammad Yusuf Shareef  
  
 Ziauddin Ahmed, 152, 152n, 157  
 Zorawar Singh, Major Thakur, 156, 156n, 157  
 Zutshi, Laddi Prasad, 5